THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH

Volume XVI NOVEMBER, 1930 Number 4

SHAKESPEAREAN TRADITION IN THE THEATRE*

W. BRIDGES ADAMS
Director of Stratford-On-Avon Festival Co.,
of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre

IT would be discourteous not to preface my remarks by some acknowledgment of the high praise that you, Sir, have bestowed upon the Company which for several years it has been my privilege to direct. There is no more effective stimulus to good work than a generous and ready response. Not only here in Philadelphia but throughout this great Republic, I can assure you it has been a very easy thing for us to give our best.

Like the Sophists of ancient Greece, I am to do my best with the subject that has been set me. I hope that, as the Sophists were reputed to do I shall not make the worse appear the better cause, I am to talk to you about Shakespearean Tradition in the theatre. The subject being a wide one, and my time limited, I propose to confine my observations to the English theatre.

By derivation the word *tradition* means, of course, something that has been handed down. A good dictionary definition is "an unwritten memorial." The notion that the past is always with us must be familiar to any of you who have attempted to explore what is called the Fourth Dimension, or have at any time experienced, under the name of "flesh creeping," that spasmodic contraction of the pelt which stiffened the fur of our remote Ancestor when a twig snapped behind him in the forest. So also is tradition always with us. We may be unaware of it, we may ignore it, we may attempt to cut ourselves adrift from it, but we can-

* An address delivered before The English Teachers' Club of Philadelphia.

not escape it. It is hardly possible to think of any human event, either a deliberate act or an accidental happening, in which the force of tradition does not play some part.

It has been well said that there is something wrong with the man who is not a socialist in his youth and a conservative in his maturity. The truth is that the wise and well-balanced man is something of both throughout his life, and bestrides the present with one foot in the past and one in the future. I think that was the case with Shakespeare.

The structure of human progress, then, is erected upon the foundations of the past. This is certainly true in the theatre, emphatically true in the Shakespearean theatre.

The basic tradition of the theatre is that the actor must, so to speak, sing for his supper. That is the healthy, normal urge of our profession. We may succeed, we may become rich, we may live in Park Avenue or Mayfair, but unless we remember we are but the descendants of the vagabond who trudged the white roads of France, singing for his food (or stealing it when he could not get an audience to listen to him),—unless we remember we are first cousins of the dilapidated individual who, in England, is still allowed to stand on the sidewalk and entertain the queue, we lose touch with the fundamentals of our profession and our art; and from that moment, although our material success may grow, our souls are in a decline. That tradition found perhaps the best expression it has ever had in the Preface to the First Folio, of which the burden is: "Whatever you do, Buy." These words were written by the joint editors, Heming and Condell, themselves players of Shakespeare's theatre, who out of reverence and affection for their master resolved to transmit, by the printing-press, this price-less heritage to mankind. Whenever people today have qualms about the alleged conflict of Art and Commerce in the theatre, I want to send them back to that Preface, which is the healthiest corrective of a queasy conscience in this matter that I know.

When we pass from that basic tradition of the theatre to what one understands by stage tradition, we have to recognize that what chiefly matters is acting tradition. These plays were written to be acted, and it is through the acting they receive today that they survive, as far as their life with the great public is concerned.

None the less it would not be amiss to trace briefly the development of the theatre, the play-house performance, from medieval times to the days that we live in now.

You are possibly familiar with the conditions governing the performance of religious drama in the Middle Ages. A so-called "Pageant Cart" was drawn about the town, and stopped at street corners, where an episode of Bible history was played. There were many such carts, and many such episodes. On a single day of festival, a procession of them would move slowly through the town, and by standing at one corner you could in the course of the day see the whole series of episodes acted before you in turn. Picture this Pageant Cart as a two-storeyed structure, the floor of a flat wagon serving as a stage, with a protecting canopy erected overhead. And now imagine it, in the course of its progress, being drawn into the galleried yard of an Inn. Since one side of the cart might possibly be draped with a kind of background you would plant it, not in the center of the yard, but against one side. You would find that the inn-yard had great points over the street corner, because people could stand to watch in the galleries as well as on the ground, and, by standing on several levels, a greater number could see and hear the play at one and the same time. If, as may have happened in the Middle Ages, the street performances were subject to disturbance, you could exercise a certain amount of supervision on the people in the yard. You might even, if you chose, make a charge for admission. Now, imagine this cart a permanent fixture. Imagine it extended to left and right, and forwards. Imagine the roof over it raised considerably. Imagine the galleries behind it pressed into service for particular situations in the action of the play, as when a balcony or the poop of a ship was necessary, and you begin to see how, from the moment we made our Pageant Cart stationary in an Inn-yard, we began to approach very near to the theatre of Queen Elizabeth's day, with whose general plan you are no doubt familiar. Assuming that development, we can better imagine the conditions of the Elizabethan theatre: open air, a dense crowd in the cockpit, privileged spectators actually on the stage—conditions not altogether dissimilar from those of a political meeting at election time; conditions teeming with humanity, but ministering to the ear rather than the eye. There was nothing of what we now know as the "pic-

ture-frame'' stage. You must not suppose that an actor played in the Elizabethan theatre as he would play today. He would rather bear himself as an accomplished speaker addressing a public meeting: a line flung here and a line there; and in that way the actor, like an orator, exerted his spell.

Now perhaps you will see how contemporary conditions must have affected the quality of the acting. I think there can be no question but that the acting of the Elizabethan period was what we should call rhetorical. At the same time, there is no reason to suppose that it became rhetorical in a bad sense until much later. The pre-Shakespearean drama of England is extraordinarily simple and human; the great flood of the Renaissance, bearing down upon it, enriched it with its own magnificence; and in the event the Elizabethan drama achieved a blend of splendour and simplicity which is the very spirit of Shakespeare.

But the Elizabethan theatre developed. There is no reason to suppose that it stood still any more than the theatre stands still today. A gradual fusion took place between the open-air, non-scenic theatre and the indoor, spectacular masque; indeed it is a fact that the first performance of *The Tempest* was given under conditions much resembling those of the modern stage; that is to say, with artificial lighting, orchestra, and mechanical changes of scene. This is established by certain stage accounts which are still extant, and were brought to my notice by an English man of letters, to the confusion of certain people who were claiming that Shakespeare's plays should be given under the exact conditions of their first performance. I may say in passing that such people have their case weakened by the fact that when they come down to details they themselves are profoundly uncertain what those conditions were.

With the scenic and more elaborate theatre of the Restoration, it is to be supposed that Shakespearean acting entered upon a period of decline. Then was the heyday of the rhetorical school. Then was the time that people (in a sense quite foreign to that which we associate with Dr. Furness here) began to ''edit'' Shakespeare. Then was the time that Dryden and Davenant sought to improve *The Tempest* by the addition of lines, scenes and characters of their own, bringing the thing into conformity with the enlightenment of their own day. From the 17th to the 18th Cen-

tury, one might trace, as far as Shakespeare was concerned a corresponding change in the actor. What preserved our drama, and our acting, in this period of decline was the birth of Restoration Comedy, a strong and virile growth which culminated in Sheridan, and still influences the English Comic Theatre of to-day. The 19th Century saw the rhetorical school still flourishing. Moreover, the stage producer began to amuse himself with archaeological exactitude in the treatment of the plays. When English acting had almost elocuted itself out of existence, it was saved, as Carrick and Siddons saved it in the 18th Century, by Phelps, and by Henry Irving, who, although in his productions he carried on the archaeological tradition of Charles Kean, brought—just as Garrick and Siddons had brought—the "flash of lightning" feeling back to Shakespeare. When a due regard for tradition is in danger of degenerating into mere traditionalism it is as a rule the actor who saves the situation.

We may make a guess at the type and quality of Burbage. Like his Chief, I suspect he was very much the child of Medieval England by the Renaissance. He must have had the virtues of the men who in the earlier religious drama played Noah just as racily, Joseph as humanly, Herod as fiercely, and the Fiend with as keen an eye to popular laughter and applause. I think at the same time he must have had in him what one can only call once more the magnificience of the human spirit that was set free by the Renaissance, which truly came as more than a liberation: as a sudden legacy undreamt of by poor men. You may imagine him holding his audience above him, below him, and on five sides of a hexagon, under conditions which, whatever people may say who wish to go back to the old ways, must have meant that the greater part of the time he had his back or his shoulder to a large portion of the house. I think his utterance was rapid. The extreme length of *Hamlet* is not evidence as to the time that its performance actually took upon Shakespeare's stage. I do not mean it was so rapidly spoken that what takes us five hours to play today took two hours then. I mean that the version of *Hamlet* we now have is something far fuller than that which was usually given. Still, we may imagine his speech as faster than ours in playing Shakespeare to-day,—as fast, let us say, as in a modern play on Broadway.

As I have said, in the rhetorical period which followed, we

must picture a gradual forsaking of the Shakespearean simplicity. Don't forget that great artists have never been afraid of simplicity. That vital quality away, what remained must have seemed to our ears empty, sounding shell. It continued to sound through the portentous five-act tragedies of the 18th Century. In this decline it was such artists as Garrick and Siddons who saved English classical acting from the ranters; the one by his keen intelligence, the other by her power of strong and sustained emotion; both by their passionate sincerity. I believe it was said of Garrick that seeing him in one of the great parts was like reading Shakespeare by flashes of lightning. Of Mrs. Siddons it is related that once when, buying some material in a linen-draper's for her costume as Lady Macbeth, she asked, in her murder-scene voice, "Will it wash?" The young man who was serving her behind the counter was so overcome that he collapsed and was carried out.

Still, the ranting school took, like King Charles the Second, an unconscionable time dying. It was barely moribund in the latter part of the 19th Century when, as we have seen, Sir Henry Irving (himself sometimes falsely classed among the ranters) came along and helped to kill it. Alleged by some people to be voiceless, he set himself to discover, not how much noise he could cram into Shakespeare, but how much meaning he could get out of him. He was eminently one of those actors who could make a word *talk*. Here, I should say, he was in the direct Burbage tradition; because there is really no way of "putting Shakespeare over" unless you can do that. The spoken word in the theatre is much more than the word itself, just as the gestures of the theatre mean, or should mean, much more than the gestures of real life.

Now let us consider some actual examples of stage tradition. We will take first the aside. It was regarded until recently as the hallmark of old-fashionedness. But no doubt a good many of you have seen "Strange Interlude." (I wonder if it occurred to you, as it did to me, what a good play it would have been if half the asides had been left out, and the transmission of the author's meaning left to the actor? I do not say all, because the aside has been so much shunned in recent years that the pendulum has now swung back, and Mr. O'Neill has written a play which consists very largely of asides.) The aside is one of the most useful and innocent devices of the theatre. We must not judge

it as it was when it reached its nadir in the melodramas of a generation ago, when one character would say of another in the middle of a scene, "He thinks I am in earnest!" I am concerned with the finer type of aside which is as much part and parcel of the art of acting as facial expression, and reached its zenith in the 18th Century Comedy. If you attempt *The School for Scandal* with the asides omitted or disguised, you take half the life out of the play. The merit of the 18th Century school (in comedy perhaps the best school of all), lay in its preoccupation with acting pure and simple. In nothing did it show its expertness more than in the proper and seemingly natural handling of the aside. The asides of Shakespeare will bear a more direct, less finished treatment. Managed with but a little of the skill which the 18th Century taught us, it need not embarrass us as an archaism. The dramatist of to-day is as a rule obsessed by his material limitations. The comparative freedom of time and place conferred on the Elizabethan stage by the absence of scenery has its counterpart in the freedom of expression which it enjoyed through its unrestricted use of the aside and, at need, of the soliloquy.

Let us take another instance: The traditional expression or intonation to be used in a given speech or line. When in doubt as to whether tradition is right or wrong, it is a good plan to consult the Folio, which is sometimes surprisingly helpful. A noteworthy example is Lady Macbeth's reply to her husband's "If we should fail—? "We fail," she answers; "But screw your courage to the sticking-place and we'll not fail." The proper reading of that *We fail* has been a bone of contention among famous actresses for generations. Some claim that it should be spoken lightly, with an air of finality and a shrug of the shoulders. Others, who excel in withering declamation, would have it spoken as a question, in scornful echo of Macbeth's hesitancy. One glance at the Folio decides the matter for all time. There is a question-mark after *we fail*. The witherers have it.

What are we to say of Shakespearean "business"? If you want an example of thoroughly bad traditionalism, the first that comes into my mind is what may be called Shakespearean Laughter: that barren device of an inexpert actor to enliven a scene he clearly thinks neither bright nor funny. He is particularly tempted to resort to it when playing one of those many characters whom

Bernard Shaw has lumped together under the comprehensive title of "Shakespeare's Merry Gentlemen." It is deplorable; the corrective is to get back to humanity. *The Merchant of Venice* affords a typical instance. Gratiano, Lorenzo, and the young men known to professional jargon as The Sals, are too often presented as Merry Gentlemen of the deepest dye. Played as they are sensible enough to play them in some German productions I have seen, as distinct individuals with lives of their own, and not as decorative adjuncts to the modern conception of the Elizabethan conception of Venice in the 16th Century, the Merry Gentlemen disappear and human beings take their place.

Of irrelevant traditional business there is only this to be said: Study of the text will soon show you whether it is relevant or not. If not, it should be ruthlessly cut out. On the other hand, there is certain relevant and authentic business which is in the life-blood of the plays. It may lie forgotten for generations, and then once more assert itself. Such an instance occurred within my own experience when I first produced *Richard III.* I invented, as I fondly believed, some business in the council-chamber scene which fitted play, situation and characters to a nicety. It transpired, however, that it was not new, but so old that recent generations had forgotten it. Here tradition indeed worked unseen. It may have been original business at the Globe.

Much might be said of traditional business as modified—and legitimately so—according to the temperament and powers of the individual actor. A good instance is the familiar interpolation after the scene of Jessica's abduction in *The Merchant of Venice:* the return of Shylock. Irving used to come back to his house and knock once (later, I fancy, he knocked three times); and the curtain fell. Arthur Bourchier came back through a loggia and across a bridge, and knocked three times: and the curtain fell. Sir Herbert Tree came back through the entire Ghetta, knocked three times, made a room-to-room search of a transparent house, emerged, cast dust and ashes on his head, uttered a string of authentic Hebrew curses, and collapsed foaming at the mouth, and the curtain fell. As a rule, this over-elaboration of interpolated business betrays the actor's doubt of his ability to rise to the heights of the subsequent Passion Scene. If able, and confident of his ability, he will marshal his resources for the scene that Shakespeare wrote,

and not squander them on a scene he did not write. On the other hand, a stage fit is both easy and effective, and the weaker actor will pin his reputation to that, and play the Passion Scene quietly and with what he hopes may be praised as "restraint."

Of traditional characterization—a subject on which volumes might be written—we can only consider briefly a few instances. A typical example, and a bad one, is the traditional rendering of Mark Antony. Now the hero of *Julius Caesar* is not Antony, but Brutus. In the hands of an actor-manager playing the part for the sake of the Forum scene, this noble Roman schemer, so sharply limned by Shakespeare, and so clearly the Antony of the later play, is moralised into a still-life study of mere nobility. Brutus is left nowhere, and a supreme instance of contrasting types goes by the board, to the incalculable disadvantage of the play. To achieve this melancholy piece of vandalism the proscription scene, in which Antony bargains with his fellow Triumvirs for the lives of their personal friends and relatives, has of course to be omitted.

On the other hand, an example of traditional characterization that is wholly right is the stock presentment of Richard, Duke of Gloucester. There has been a tendency recently to whitewash the character of Richard. Historically, there is something to be said for it. In the theatre it is sheer waste of time. Shakespeare leaves us in no doubt whatever when he means to draw a thorough rogue. His Richard the Third is an early Gothic devil, a gargoyle touched with fairy-tale magic and decked with Renaissance splendour. He is Punchinello, he is the Demon Barber of Fleet Street, he is Mr. Quilp. The Cibber version is a bad version; but any actor with true theatre-stuff in him knows that the only way to play Richard is the Cibber way.

A much more difficult problem is presented by the evolution on our stage, of the character of Shylock. Shylock began life as the Jew of Malta. In the hands of Shakespeare, wise and tolerant before his time, he is drawn with an insight and understanding which give the cue to an actor of today to do almost anything he likes with the part. But the humane modern conception of a patriarchal, almost a noble, Shylock goes, I think, very much farther than Shakespeare intended. It would be fanciful, perhaps, to attribute it to the liberal-mindedness of that comfortably progressive age which acclaimed a Prime Minister of Shylock's

race. But whatever its origin, it is certain that so-called "sympathetic" treatment of Shylock has disastrous consequences for the play as a whole, and merely accentuates the faint flavour of caddishness which the modern palate may be forgiven for detecting in it. After all, it is *the Comedy of The Merchant of Venice* and not *the Tragedy of Shylock;* and there is no hope for that last act unless at the end of the trial scene we are made to feel that a rat has been stamped underfoot. The just treatment of the part, in fact, remains what it was in Shakespeare's day. That was given by, in our own time, the Dutch actor, Louis Bouwmeester, who was unforgettably horrible, and allowed himself not one atom of sympathy from his audience. The great scenes had their full passionate effect, and he ranked as the greatest Shylock of his generation; but for once the balance of the play was not destroyed.

I propose to say nothing here about mounting, lighting, or that much paragraphed person, the modern stage-director. These matters command too much attention to-day, to the neglect of the Art of Acting.

The true heirs of tradition are the young. It is for us to place it at their disposal,—not to invite their rebellion by imposing it. If we do that, we may rest assured that they will discover for themselves what to reject, and what to preserve, enrich, and transmit to those who come after them.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS DEBATES THE NAVAL TREATY

GLADYS MURPHY GRAHAM

FIVE days have passed since the ancient, weighty and honorable House of Lords of England took upon itself a consideration of the London naval treaty, and the echoes of its debate have resounded in London, crossed the ocean—rousing a Senator to the notably American reservation point—and returned to Europe again. It is not often that the noble lords, in the midst of the pomp and circumstance of their inner chamber, pronounce as vitally or with as far-flung repercussions. To read the debate in part, as the great majority of the Opposition and the one struggling Government paper give it, naturally with a selectivity carefully deter-

mined according to political bias, holds a keen speech and argumentation as well as a political interest; to hear it from the coveted vantage point of one of the fourteen red, crown-backed chairs just outside the sacred railing on the floor of the House was an experience.

The parliamentary seating in both the British Houses is itself, of course, a dramatization of the clash and conflict. One realizes in the case of the Lords that if there is power in numbers the tremendous advantage is thereby thrown to the Opposition under the present Labour regime—at the maximum twelve Labour Lords sprinkled over the benches on the right, facing over seven hundred non-Labour. And literally facing, across a narrow space in which bewigged scribes sat at work. To the support of numbers was added on the afternoon of the naval debate the pompous and solemn weight of acknowledged authority. It was no ordinary Opposition member who turned the verbal barrage on the Government's naval policy and moved for papers, but none other than the great Earl Beatty, leader of the battle cruisers at Jutland, commander of the Great Fleet, First Sea-Lord in the post-war period. Lord Beatty, then, with reinforcements immediately brought forward by "the noble and gallant" Earl Jellicoe, Admiral of the Fleet—and England does not forget or underestimate her naval heroes. Two great and famous admirals with a well-filled Opposition section in obvious sympathy (the brilliant robes singled out the Archbishop of Canterbury with his inevitable opinion) doing battle against a handful on the Labour bench....

Lord Beatty proved himself a speech opponent of decided power, with a tremendous element of strength in the solemn weight of his presence and manner of address. He will look exceeding well on a monument. Leaning forward a little and standing perfectly still, presenting in a deep voice his ominous warning, he was a dominant figure. With extreme gravity he outlined the consequence of the "great and deplorable blunder" of the treaty; he touched heavily and darkly upon elements dear to the heart of all Britishers—sea power and the Empire, trade routes and food supply....The term 'skilfully" would be utterly out of place in relation to the Lord Beatty type, yet certainly he proceeded not without knowledge of the emotional keyboard. The psychology of fear was put to use as he spoke of the Mediterranean,

of the recent utterances of Signor Mussolini. And throughout His Lordship stood firmly and solidly upon the pedestal of his own authority: "I have worked out these problems before . . ." Again and again cheers and "Hear, hear" interrupted the speaker; he closed amid a burst of applause. The great Lord Beatty had spoken with the somber power that carries conviction and had requested papers. Lord Jellicoe, again from authority's high eminence, announced his complete agreement with his fellow-admiral and brought to bear his quota of reputation and of fears. The attack had been made; it was for the Government to meet it.

Lord Parmoor, Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House, rose. There could hardly have been a more painful contrast. Lord Parmoor is old, querulous, unimpressive—and every quality was accentuated by comparison. The *Morning Post* declared with more truth than kindness that the Leader of the House should now adopt the role of *silent* councillor, and added that his "peculiar type of oratory" had the immediate effect of sending most of their Lordships "scuttling." True, there was a considerable exodus but another element of cause must be taken into account: when Lord Beatty finished it was the hour for tea on the Terrace by the Thames, and tea is as truly and sacredly an English tradition as "Empire" or "sea-power." Yet taken at its best Lord Parmoor's method of speech is not of a sort likely to hold any group. Answering a definite challenge, his tone bordered on the apologetic. He attempted to defend the stand of the Government by a series of rambling statements to the effect that in making its decisions the advice of the naval experts of the Admiralty had been followed throughout. It was a reply lacking practically everything in speech power. Only once was there an encounter in which the House Leader met an attack and countered it by a clever turn—"cunningly and evasively," according to the Opposition papers! Mention was being made of the fact that the agreement under discussion involved the whole of the British Empire when Lord Jellicoe interrupted with the revelation that he had been asked to represent New Zealand at the Conference and had been told that it was not desired by the Government to have expert advice other than that of the Admiralty! It was a vital thrust; Lord Parmoor met it with an unexpected adroitness in the question whether the noble Earl was suggesting

that the Dominions entering into the treaty acted without expert advice which they could trust, that they acted wrongly in taking the advice of the Board of Admiralty! Lord Jellicoe was now the one in a difficult position: certainly exactly such a suggestion had been implied in his statement, its tone and its setting, yet the last thing he wished to do was to make it explicit. The "noble and gallant Lord" stated that he would not wish to criticize the Dominions—and subsided! Lord Parmoor proceeded dully.

A second interruption and question, this time from Lord Carson, brought out a point worth a moment's attention. Lord Parmor had said that there were "changed conditions" explaining the reduction in the naval program of 1930 below that of 1927, and Lord Carson inquired the nature of the changed conditions. The answer was that they lay in "the growth of a general spirit of friendship and a desire for friendship between countries." At no other time did His Lordship's words to the particular group facing him seem more futile, never had he himself perhaps realized more fully their futility. The thing apparent was said to me on the Terrace by a Lord from the Labour bench: the two speakers and the parties they represented were working from utterly different premises. Given the conception of the constant likelihood of attack and of fleets and armaments as the only method of security, the admirals were perfectly right, the treaty would lay the country open to grave dangers; given the newer conception of security as a thing of voluntary agreement and ideological factors, and a totally different conclusion followed. The two sets of arguments were the parallel lines that could not meet. Starting with different basic assumptions each, following the road of straight deduction, might quite logically arrive at exactly opposite conclusions.

The realization of the situation threw into relief the problem of authority. Lord Beatty and Lord Jellicoe stood so heavily upon it. And unquestionably they are great naval experts but by that very fact and the circumscription and bias of thought which it implies, was not their opinion subject to a high rate of discount on a question of naval reduction? In brief, can the authority of war, bound up in its presuppositions and psychology, be carried over as authority in the ways of peace? It is a special case of a neat problem in the transposition of authority, and it held

the thought recurrently in the background of speeches that never met as they proceeded, one directly, one wanderingly toward the conclusion inherent in the assumed premises.

Eventually Lord Parmoor was done. Lord Stanhope and Lord Lloyd spoke briefly for the opposition adding nothing of moment. It looked as if the end had come—and decidedly the battle was to the admirals. However, on the front Labour bench was a tall peer who had been listening with a smile around the corners of his mouth scarcely in harmony with the solemnity of the ancient House. The Secretary of State for Air in the Labour cabinet, Lord Thompson, newly elevated to the peerage, rose—and as he spoke the wigs of the scribes seemed a trifle out of place! One would have known that he had not been born to this august company; indeed he almost mentioned the House of Commons, which by imprescriptible custom is known to the Lords only as "another place."

With Lord Thompson entirely new elements were introduced into the debate: marked argumentative skill, satire and the prick of amusement, a touch of charm. He realized perfectly that the admirals were speaking on the basis of an utterly different assumption from that on which the Government had proceeded, and so he moved directly over to where they stood, assumed them to be right, and asked "What then?" If the picture were so black as the noble and gallant Lord had painted it, then certainly the seventy cruisers he suggested would not be sufficient; it would take one hundred and seventy to make the country safe. Lord Thompson saw no possibility of stopping at seventy in the face of such grave danger yet he "trembled to think what the bill would be which any Government following this advice would have to present to Parliament." There was reason in it and a mild satire under the touch of which the dignity of the monumental Lord Beatty bristled. He reiterated with a touch of heat that his figure had been seventy. And again Lord Thompson met him exactly where he stood: if seventy was the requirement for safety as Lord Beatty insisted, why was it that in the past when he (Lord Beatty) was the principal naval adviser to his Government that standard had not been maintained? Why was it that the Sea-Lord had tolerated such a state of affairs that Labour, on coming into power, had found but fifty-four cruisers and four building, a situation

which in their mature opinion constituted a menace to the British Empire? Lord Thompson could not quite see "how Lord Beatty and Lord Jellicoe stood it for those five years when the British navy was being let down"—Conservative years! It was keen argument. The speaker paused. There was silence.

Then came the matter of the motion for papers, for the text of the actual advice of the Admiralty Board as given during the treaty negotiations. It was a demand distinctly analogous to that of the opposition bloc in the American Senate in relation to the confidential conversations during the pre-signature period. It is possible that Lord Beatty's motion was influenced from across the water, or it may have been entirely his own idea. Lord Thompson was far from apologetic in the tone of his response to the proposal. Immediately he took the offensive: he did not have the questionnaire which was put presumably by the First Lord to his expert advisers and, furthermore, if he had, he would not give it! Even the paper which carried the fullest account of the proceedings (the London *Times*) did not mention the stir on the Opposition benches or the brief, electric period of rapid-fire question and half-question. The speaker stood his ground: as a matter of principle it was highly objectionable that opinions expressed by experts to their political chief should be bandied about in legislative chambers. If that were done, the experts would never give advice again. It was exactly as if letters from an Ambassador were to be made public. There were such things as confidential papers. The buzz subsided; the Opposition benches settled back far from pleased, but silenced. Lord Thompson had won his crucial point.

A few seconds' pause and his manner changed. He leaned forward. The frontal attack rebuttal was over, the element of persuasion came into play as he spoke of the general situation into which the treaty entered, of the thing it attempted to do. His honesty and measure of statement were disarming. He did not claim great things for the treaty: there was no one more dissatisfied in a sense than the Prime Minister but it was a big effort in the right direction.... It was a delightful piece of constructive argument done against tremendous odds—an Opposition is, in the very nature of the case, pre-convinced. Lord Thompson was done.

The last word was with Lord Beatty: weightily he stated that not one single fear in his mind when he came into the House had been removed. The announcement did not come with the shock of surprise. One felt certain that if Deity Himself had spoken—through the medium of course of an "effulgent light" in full deference to British law which forbids any other representation and thereby excludes *The Green Pastures* from the English stage—His Lordship would not have been moved. But having thus made it clear that he remained totally unaffected in his belief, he asked leave to withdraw his motion for papers—the practical and crucial point under debate.

Not to the strong was the battle ....

"The motion was accordingly withdrawn and the House rose at 7:28 p. m."

MAL-PRACTICE IN SPEECH CONTESTS

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON
Washington Square College, New York University

IN the past two decades there has taken place a rapid development in speech training, in its academic recognition, in the growth of its departments and courses, including graduate courses, in the quality of its instruction, and in its useful scholarly research. Encouraging as these signs are, nevertheless, in the light of our achievements, we need to take stock of all that we are doing, to determine at what points in our line we are not advancing.

With this purpose in view I have been making an investigation of contest speaking, and the following represents conclusions drawn, the principal one being that, educationally, our contests have not kept pace with the training given in speech courses, that they do not show evidence of the same psycholgical application, and of general research. If the textbooks on speech used throughout the country are any indication of what is being generally taught, then the entire trend in public speaking has been away from a pedagogy based rather upon training in the externals of voice, diction, pronunciation, and the saying of beautiful nothings on the one hand, and of academic argument on the other, to speech as a means of communication of purpose, as a means of gaining an

audience response, with voice, diction, and movement merely woven in as an incidental part of that pattern. The old aimed too largely at exhibition; the new departs from exhibition to designed response. Now while the class-room pedagogy is based upon the new, our contests still cling by far too largely to the old.

This clinging to the old is the more unfortunate for the reason that it is largely through our contests we are known to our colleagues and to the public. Our good deeds are practiced in the obscurity of our class-rooms, while our misdeeds are practiced where we can get publicity for them, and if many of our colleagues continue to draw their skirts away from us, we are ourselves somewhat to blame. It is well to remember that many of the middle-aged and older members of other departments were themselves subjected as students to the very type of speech instruction we speech teachers condemn. The head of another department in our college, when asked to be a judge of one of our contests, responded by saying that he was "agin all oratory in any form" and would be a prejudiced judge. Our department held a grude against him until we learned that in his college days he had undergone a course in speech gymnastics of the worst sort, which had not at all prepared him for the public speaking he has had to learn since by his own efforts. This professor took a different attitude when he understood that our speech department was trying to teach students the speaking technique which he had had to learn by experience.

Another example is a dean of a teachers' training school, who rejected a plan of speech training when proposed by a public speaking teacher, yet afterwards inaugurated an inferior system of training in oral English. The pathetic point is that that dean wanted what was proposed, but shied off because the proposer called it "public speaking" and was himself a public speaking teacher. The dean associated the term "public speaking" with an objectionable thing.

A colleague, now the head of a graduate school, told me several years ago that he believed it as hopeless an effort to try to teach people to speak as to teach them to teach. His remarks showed only prejudice and no knowledge of what constitutes speech instruction.

The hosts of H. L. Menckens and Sinclair Lewises make it plain that there is also a considerable non-academic intellectual

opposition to what is known as public speaking and oratory. That there is confusion in the public mind as to what constitutes a good speech can be attested by any speech teacher who has served frequently as judge of oratorical contests with bankers, lawyers, and politicians as his fellow judges. How often has he not found himself in the minority and seen the award given to the speaker who did his "spread-eagle stuff" the best? That political America is known even abroad for its eagle-screaming, flag-waving, high-flown oratory is attested by Shaw in his latest play, *Apple Cart*. The American ambassador is the high-school boy-orator to a T. A letter I have had from a friend of my pre-teaching days might stand as a monument to what the public thinks we do in speech courses. He facetiously asks, "Are you still teaching the younger generation to wave its arms and garble sweet sounds?"

Milton Cross, American Academy gold-medal radio-announcer, speaking recently at the dedication of the new School of Education building of New York University, openly denounced "so-called public-speaking courses" given in colleges and universities. His remarks showed clearly that he had no idea of what is given in such courses; but two things are certain: one, that something in his experience must have impressed him unfavorably with college public speaking, and, two, that his denunciation before hundreds of educators, many of them heads of departments of English, did the public speaking cause no good.

Without attempt to generalize from these few examples, I should merely say that the experience of probably all of us makes it evident that the last thing our instruction can afford to be associated with in the eyes of educators, scholars, and the public is the kind of oratory typical of nominating and other speeches of political conventions, speeches on the whole of unintelligent glorification, false sentimentalization, with the attitude of "we are in the right and all others in the wrong"—speeches verbose, sickening, anathema to all intelligent persons.

It is with this association in mind that I have approached the inter-scholastic and inter-collegiate contests on the Constitution, and from my own experience and from the statements of representative members of our profession in the colleges and high schools conclude that, with some notable exceptions, the speeches in general take their model from the worst form of partisan political

speaking. The principal reason for this is the essential nature of the contests and the subjects prescribed. These are, *The Constitution,* or *Washington and the Constitution,* or some of our other national heroes and the Constitution. Since these deal with the past only and with national symbols and stereotypes of emotional connotation there is little left for the student to do but engage in glorification too often insincere and uninformed, but, at any event, conducive to the most sickening type of oratory. Behind the choice of these subjects is, naturally, the purpose of the sponsors, the contributors of all the thousands of dollars in prizes and trips abroad.

The purpose of some of these contributors, for example *The New York Times,* is, I am convinced, a sincere attempt at wholesome Americanization propaganda, and it is not the purpose of this paper of the inclination of its author to attack such wholesome intention. The purpose of the New York City Board of Education, I am convinced after discussion with Mr. Harold Campbell, Associate Superintendent in charge of high schools, is the furtherance of a much needed Americanization educational program. With this I have no quarrel, but sympathy. As a teacher of speech, however, and a defender of the principles and standards of my profession I must condemn these contests on the ground that, not only do they not further the best interests of the profession of teachers of speech, but also that, from the point of view of speech training, they are bad educationally. In my attitude I am supported by practically all the leaders in speech training in our foremost universities and in the New York City high schools. Among statements which I have received are those from five past presidents and the incumbent president of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, a number of these former editors of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH: John Dolman Jr., University of Pennsylvania, J. A. Winans, Dartmouth College, J. M. O'Neill, University of Michigan, A. T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin, W. J. Kay, University of West Virginia, Ray K. Immel, Dean of the School of Speech, University of Southern California. Many others are prominent in the field of speech for one reason or another: E. L. Hunt, Swarthmore College, former editor; H. H. Hudson, President, Eastern Public Speaking Conference; H. A. Wichelns, director of the graduate division of the public speaking department of Cornell University; A. Craig Baird, nationally

known debate authority; R. C. Reager, Rutgers University; and W. M. Parrish, University of Pittsburgh. The greater number of these men are heads of university speech departments and authors of note. It is interesting to observe that not a single one of these men, and only one of the others in the colleges heard from, raised a voice in defence of the Constitution contests; all but this one were opposed on one ground or another and some were vehement in condemnation.

Among the New York City high-school teachers taking a stand against the contest in its present form are: Mrs. Letitia Raubicheck, Director of the Department of Speech Improvement, New York City Board of Education; Miss Sara Barber, Chairman of the Speech Department of Richmond Hill High School and President of the New York City Association of teachers of speech; and many chairmen of English departments and speech departments. A number of these will be quoted later.

The basis for the condemnation on educational grounds is as follows:

1. Instead of guiding a student to adapt his research, his consideration, the nature of his composition, his wording, and his vocal and bodily delivery to his audience, with the idea of accomplishing a purpose directly affecting that audience, these contests tend to have him consider the audience a secondary factor and the judges the primary. This is a reversal of the fundamental postulations of sound speech pedagogy. The audience becomes mere spectators taking in a show, not participants in a question that effects them. The entire thing becomes an exhibition, not a matter of audience adaptation and response.

The Director of Speech Improvement of the New York City Board of Education says, that "the topic is so remote from the immediate interests of the students that it has, heretofore, attracted to the contest only those students who are interested in exhibitionism, and, in the schools with which I am familiar at least, the finer students have not taken part. This has put a premium upon the flag-waving, eagle-screaming type of oratory which all of the work of the Speech Department has been attempting to overthrow." The opinion of the President of the Association of New York high-school teachers of speech runs along the same lines: "It is high time as teachers, and I hope educators, we protested against

perfunctory patriotism. I believe that in some ways the best interests of speech education are not served—because frequently the decision rendered by the judges gives high place to insincerity in delivery and to a type of cheap oratory."

2. In construction and use of language as far as the participants' speech education is concerned, little is gained and much is lost. A natural and persuasive use of the idiom of our tongue is sacrificed in what is only too often a school boy's weak attempt to imitate a Daniel Webster, with a consequent verbosity and bombast that has little if any place in the speech occasions of life. Sound rhetorical principles that have to do with public speech are generally not learned or applied; in which case the effort has achieved nothing educationally in this regard. As a matter of fact, as in the case of the New York City contest, the speech teacher is too often not called into consultation in the matter of composition, but is expected merely to polish off the arm-waving and vocalizing process. As a conseuence, as J. M. O'Neill has said in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION, "Many of the speeches seem rather to be essays than speeches."[1] While proficiency in the technic of the essay can generally be conceded to the teacher of English, it cannot be expected that he be equally, if at all, proficient in the principles of speech composition. One is forced to suspect, too, after reading or listening to a great many contest speeches, particularly by high-school students, that the students are coached by fond teachers beyond the point of any personal originality or contribution.

3. The subjects are of a nature to frustrate rather than encourage any original thinking. In a review of a book of such speeches, O'Neill says, "I have not found in the 24 speeches in this book a single new, searching, or arresting observation in regard to the Constitution of the United States or of the great Americans whose names are bracketed with it in the official list of subjects."[2] The subjects are too broad, as several of the correspondents have stated, for anything but a superficial discussion, and as a consequence the speakers are not obliged to gain a real mastery of a subject, but grab up a few ideas and statements as material to win.

[1] April, 1927, p. 196.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

Winans, of Dartmouth, one of the foremost authorities on public speaking, writes in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:[3] "It was my painful task one year, as judge of a sectional college contest, to read eighteen orations. A drearier waste of ignorance and fustian would be hard to find. In only one or two could one find evidence that the writers had given any attention to political science. One guessed that the writers had read only some purple patches of praise and perfervid perorations; and had thought not at all." Speaking for his department at Cornell, H. A. Wichelns says, "As at present conducted, this contest seems to us not a proper support for an educational program. Students are practically forced to take a brief, rather than encouraged to that independent thought which should always precede speaking." This agrees with a statement by W. M. Parrish of Pittsburgh, "The contests on the Constitution seem to me to be particularly bad in encouraging extravagant and uncritical laudation and mere form, at the expense of thought and originality."

Professor W. Hayes Yeager, of George Washington University, says:

"There were ten contestants in our local contest for the selection of a university representative. I don't believe that a single idea in the ten speeches had a bit of glue on it. I believe that this contest encourages emptiness of thought. All of the speeches were of the over ornate, ballyhoo type, with simulated emotionalism.

"My experience with this contest leads me to the conclusion that it is distinctly bad training for college and university orators and the same thing appears to me to be true in the high schools. The fact that the orations must be of such a character as 'to increase interest in and respect for the Constitution,' makes it bad educationally. The critical type of oration has little, if any, chance in one of these contests."

A statement of Ray K. Immel, Dean of the School of Speech at the University of Southern California is worth quoting. He says:

"I seriously doubt the wisdom of holding any speaking contest in which the student is limited to the expression of a single point of view. I should endorse a contest on the Constitution in

[3] June, 1928, p. 440.

which the student might be free to express his honest belief, but in this contest the student is free to express an honest belief only in case his belief happens to coincide with the belief of the Better America Federation."

4. Where teachers are obliged, for the sake of their own reputations, or through imposition by a higher authority—as in the case of the New York City schools—to coach the contestants, the time spent in trying to teach a *few* students something about speech that the very nature of the contest makes a rather futile task might be spent to better advantage upon a larger number of speech students who need the attention. This comment is made almost more than any other by the high school critics and mentioned by one college authority. One thing is certain, that from all points of view, none of these contests are run for the benefit of the boys and girls who participate. Be the purpose advertising, Americanization, or alarmist propaganda, the students who take part are merely incidental to it and are as much exploited as are genuine speech interests. The fuss made over the thing, in long newspaper columns, in contests held before judges, college presidents, and Supreme Court Justices, in large sums and foreign trips as prizes is all out of proportion to the value of what the student has done. From the educational viewpoint, the result to the student is apt to be that, while he may have acquired some desirable characteristics of self-confidence and bodily and vocal control, he is apt to be left, after all his effort, without much real equipment to meet the audience situations of life. He may with a little histrionic talent win a national contest without having any real capacity for original speaking, for the contest has not sufficiently aided him to do research for an audience, compose for an audience, and be logically and verbally flexible in the presence of an audience, or to be emotionally adjusted to the extemporaneous speaking situation. Yet the contestant is apt to feel that he has arrived, when in reality he is merely making a beginning. This fact is commented upon by a number of the high-school teachers. Perhaps all experienced speech teachers can attest that high-school oratorical contest winners are among the least teachable in speech courses when they get to college.

In the organization and furtherance of these contests, we speech teachers have not been asked, "Will ye, or will ye nay?",

but we have been merely taken for granted. We have not been responsible, except insofar as we have permitted intrusion into our domain, except as we have permitted other interests to betray our interests. Participation has been obligatory upon many teachers, particularly in the high schools; and in colleges, often it has been suggested to us by administrators that we take part, for the organization sponsoring the college contest yearly approaches the administration.

That these contests continue to exist in their present form year after year is to some extent our fault, for while individual voices such as those of the late C. H. Woolbert, J. A. Winans[4] and James M. O'Neill[5] have been raised in protest and denunciation, there has been no concerted action of our profession. We have passively accepted, without recognizing the entire contest situation as a matter vitally affecting our profession.

There are for us two ways out: first to try to remedy the contests; second, to withdraw, if remedy is not possible.

1. If, with the weight of the universities back of them, the New York City Association of Speech Teachers, for example, should agree on a series of remedies, I have the word of *The New York Times* representative, Waldo Walker, and of Associate Superintendent Campbell of the Board of Education, that they will do everything in their power to effect the proposals. *The Times* has been very friendly to the present investigation and looks forward to something constructive as a result of it. Mr. Walker has himself recognized a host of deficiencies and has made efforts to remedy them, for example, through the inclusion this year of an extemporaneous feature as an adjunct to the memorized speeches. He himself has proposed bringing the subjects of the speeches up to date, in a manner similar to that proposed by J. M. O'Neill.[6] So

[4] *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, June, 1928, pp. 438-442.
[5] *Ibid.*, April, 1927, pp. 192-197.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 195

"I would suggest bringing the subject down a little closer to the period in which the young orators live. Why not include such topics as 'Roosevelt and the Constitution,' 'LaFollette and the Constitution,' 'Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. and the Constitution'?.... for Justice Holmes as a man whose attitude toward the Constitution of the United States is particularly worthy of the study of young Americans in 1927."

if the speech teachers of New York can effect a change, perhaps concerted action of teachers in other large cities can do likewise and thus improve the entire high-school situation.

Perhaps I am pessimistic in believing that with the colleges and universities the chances of remedy are less hopeful. I say this for the reason that the organization of the two contests is not the same. The high school contests are furthered by some of the leading American newspapers, and, if the attitude of *The New York Times* is any example, are an attempt at wholesome Americanization. (As to the other newspaper sponsors, I am prepared to make no statement one way or another, either as to intention or method.) As far as I can see, there is no attempt upon the part of *The Times* through its Constitutional Contest to abbrogate the constitutional rights of political minorities. Their contest has been accompanied by no alarmist propaganda, no circulation of a bi-weekly bulletin attacking any group which does not give unqualified laudation to the American institution, whose policy would allow no place to the free speech, the open criticism of a Daniel Webster. *The Times* has no relation whatever with the sponsor of the college contest, the Better America Federation. As to the apparent aims and attitude of that Federation, I can best present them by quoting from the letter of the head of the speech work in a college which has had successful contestants. "Wesleyan University has placed two men in the national finals of the Better America Federation at Los Angeles and has cooperated practically every year with the federation in its contests. This year we are not entering because we doubt the value or the advisability of such wholesale speaking arrangements and because we are not in sympathy with the implied restrictions on opinion and approach to the subject which the bias of the organization is, I think, making obvious. In other words, I believe that the contest is a propaganda business instead of a sincere desire to create interest in the true principles of American constitutional government. The Better America Federation stands for all the intolerance and prejudices which intelligent American college man cannot ascribe to." In view of such apparent aims, there seems little hope of change.

A number of the universities have refused to have anything to do with the college contests because of unwholesome propaganda. John Dolman, of the University of Pennsylvania, say "Our atti-

tude is that since the object of the contests is propagandist, not educational, the University can take no initiative in conducting or opposing them." J. M. O'Neill, of the University of Michigan, is somewhat stronger in his assertion: "Of course the University of Michigan has nothing whatever to do with the contests. I consider them distinctly one of the most harmful influences at work in the speech field in the country. I hope you succeed in putting a crimp in the affairs of the Constitution contests." The chairman of another large university department says, "Our department has always felt doubtful about the advisability of entering our students in such contests and has steadfastly refused all invitations to do so." How far his decision is due to to the propaganda aspect, I do not know. Regarding this matter of propaganda, Professor E. L. Hunt, of Swarthmore, adds, "They send me their bi-weekly bulletin, which seems to me to be a silly attempt to alarm folk about bolshevism, and which stamps the whole business as a type of propaganda which does not interest me." H. H. Hudson, of Princeton, states, "You probably have seen the bulletin sent out by the Federation, which I suppose they get to all school boys who are interested in their contest. It seems to me one of the worst propaganda sheets in the country."

Now, none of these critics, including the writer, is, so far as I know, a boleshevist or perhaps even a radical. But they are educators, and as such must always take a stand against the futherance of unthinking prejudice and intolerance, the greatest foes of all true education; they must always take a stand against the exploitation of educational interests by any other kind of interests. I doubt if they are opposed merely to propaganda as propaganda, for, after all, liberal education is, in the final analysis, propaganda for the higher values of life. Expressing my own opinion, I should say that the Better America Federation propaganda is pernicious because essentially un-American.

Perhaps a representative committee of college speech teachers might be appointed by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH to confer with the Better America Federation. It might possibly be that the Federation would be willing to change its program and methods. The obvious purpose of the contests seems to render that unlikely; but it might be tried.

2. If, after an attempt, remedy is found impossible, there is

only one other way out for us, to retire with honor. That may be more easily said than done, particularly with our colleagues in the high schools, where the rules of a board of education must be obeyed. In the colleges, however, it should be more possible to take a stand, and to win administrative support for it. Up to this year, New York University has participated. This year, however, we withdrew, with the full support of the Dean of our College. In regard to the universities where students, even without the support of the speech department, somehow become the university's representatives, a placing of the facts before the administration might result in the refusal of the institution to have any one named as representative. College administrators might be counted upon to be swayed by an educational argument, particularly when it is as well supported as this one. If we should all take a strong stand, we could either improve these contests to a point where they could be useful to speech education, or else, improvement out of the question, eliminate them. I can conclude in no stronger manner than by the use of the forceful statements of James M. O'Neill (which in my opinion are equally applicable to the college situation): "I wish the high school students of America could be spared the hollowness, the pretense, the advertising, the generalities, of this pompous debauch in sham patriotism. The whole enterprise is lacking in dignity, in frankness, in reality, in critical study, in clear thinking, and in plain speaking."[7] "These contests are not entitled to the support of teachers of speech of the United States who are interested in the cause of good speaking."[8]

[7] *Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, April, 1927, p. 197.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 196.

A LAUGH ANALYSIS OF "THE SCHOOL FOR SCANDAL"

JOHN DOLMAN, JR.
University of Pennsylvania

THE production of audible laughter is not, of course, the only object of a good play—not even of a comedy. Nevertheless, laughter is certainly one of the legitimate pleasures of the theatre, and as long as dramatists continue to write amusing lines and create amusing situations it will be the duty of actors and directors to project these lines and situations as effectively as possible to the audience.

Not a great deal has been written and published on how to do this. Students of the theatre complain with some justice that much of the writing in their field has been a bit abstract, and that very little real help is given in practical matters. Having recently made a comparative study of the laughing responses to five successive performances of *The School for Scandal,* I have felt that that some, at least, of my observations might be of interest to other directors and teachers of speech.

The play was staged under my direction by the Players' Club of Swarthmore, Pa., a community theatre organization which offers six or seven productions a season, each under a different director, and each running for five consecutive nights. In addition to a subscribing membership of over nine hundred, about seven hundred of whom attend each production, the Club plays to about two hundred and fifty paying guests, and about one hundred and fifty invited guests. This gives an average attendance for the five nights of about two hundred and twenty. In the case of *The School for Scandal,* however, the Monday and Friday audiences were smaller than the average owing to bad weather, while the other three were larger.

Basically our five audiences were much alike, but there were minor differences—enough to accentuate the temperamental variations which all audiences seem to show. Roughly, the Monday and Tuesday audiences included the majority of our older members who knew the players well, and were personally interested in them; also the majority of our least theatre-wise members. The two groups were much alike except that the Monday group, being

smaller, was more timid, especially at first. The Wednesday audience included the largest percentage of strangers and paying guests; it was the least responsive in a personal way, the most critical, but also the most discriminating. The Thursday and Friday audiences included our most theatre-wise members, who have learned to hold off for the sake of seeing a better performance; also the largest number of invited guests. Both these audiences were discriminating, and apparently more familiar with the play than the first three; they were exceedingly responsive, even the smaller Friday audience. The Thursday night group was the quickest on the trigger, and the whole performance that night went more rapidly, ending five minutes ahead of schedule.

It is the custom of the Club to have the prompter mark in the prompt book at each performance every laugh which is loud enough and distinct enough for him to hear back stage. Although the record so compiled ignores the smiles and chuckles, taken in conjunction with the actors' own recollections it offers an interesting basis for study; and when it has to do with a standard play like *The School for Scandal* it has, I think, considerable permanent value. Through the coöperation of a particularly wide-awake and efficient prompter, Mr. Robert W. Graham, I have been able to preserve a very complete record for this play.

The record of audible laughs, act by act, for the five nights, was as follows:

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.	Total less duplications
Act I	9	11	11	10	14	22
Act II	15	17	18	25	25	33
Act III	14	20	16	27	30	45
Act IV	33	32	36	42	42	73
Act V	36	25	27	30	43	63
	107	105	108	134	154	236

The extent of the variation can hardly be seen in the first five columns, but a comparison of any one of them with the sixth will give some idea of the number of laughs that were gained or lost during the week. Not a few were heard only once; and no less than eighty-two, (236-154) heard at some time during the week, were missing on the very first night.

A careful study of each of the two hundred and thirty-six laughs recorded in our prompt book would occupy a fairly large

volume, and a good deal of it would be based upon guesswork. The best I can hope to do is to pick out a few of the more significant variations, the reasons for which seem discoverable, and to classify them according to these reasons.

Variations due to differences in the audience are, of course, more difficult to explain than those due to faults or improvements in the acting, and I shall cite only a few of them.

First of all there were some laughs on Monday and Tuesday nights, lost later in the week, that grew out of club-night conditions extraneous to the play. The first entrance of Moses and the ensuing conversation between Moses, Rowley, Sir Oliver, and Sir Peter (pages 37-39)[1] drew more laughs on those nights because the actor who played Moses was an old favorite appearing in a new low comedy part, with a somewhat grotesque make-up, and his old friends and neighbors enjoyed laughing at him. Sir Oliver, too, was a popular old timer, and drew more audible response on the first two nights, though he played much better later in the week. Responses of this sort were naturally weakest on Wednesday night—the night when the largest number of strangers paid to get in. The exit of Moses and Sir Oliver drew laughter and applause every night except Wednesday.

A number of other laughs missed fire only on Wednesday. Some of the trouble may have been due to the fact that the cast quickly sensed a more critical attitude on the part of the strangers in the audience, and grew a little nervous about it. On the whole, the Wednesday performance was the most ragged one, especially in the first three acts. Lines which depend upon good timing for their effect—such as "Down goes Maria!" and "Maria is drunk!", shouted amidst the turmoil of the drinking scene at Charles Surface's house (page 47)—lost their laughs that night.

On the other hand the same audience laughed at lines that no other audience thought funny, especially lines with a cynical flavor, or a touch of the cruel or the sinister. The gossip scene in Lady Sneerwel's drawing room, with its ill-natured scandal, drew more

[1] For the convenience of the reader who may wish to follow this study closely I cite the page numbers of specific lines and scenes discussed; the references are to the William Warren Edition, published by Walter H. Baker & Co., Boston. This text, from the Boston Museum prompt book, was the basis of our prompt book, but was collated with two older texts and revised.

laughs that night than any other, including one on Lady Teazle's ill-bred line, "What, the fat dowager that was at Mrs. Quadrille's last night!" (page 29). The two-faced lines of Joseph Surface amused the Wednesday audience, especially those in the Screen Scene, such as "Prudence, like experience, must be paid for" (page 63; spoken to Lady Teazle), and the long, hypocritical speech ending "....the man who can break through the laws of hospitality and tempt the wife of his friend deserves to be branded as the pest of society" (page 66; spoken to Sir Peter while Lady Teazle is behind the screen).

Probably a few of the lines that drew better laughs toward the end of the week did so because their subtleties, which had escaped the relatively unsophisticated Monday and Tuesday audiences, were better understood by the more theatre-wise persons who waited until Thursday or Friday night. It is difficult to distinguish such lines from the ones that were better delivered later in the week, but I am fairly sure of one or two examples, including Sir Oliver's lines in the following bit (page 51):

> CHARLES. Now I propose, Mr. Premium, if it's agreeable to you, a post-obit on Sir Oliver's life: though at the same time the old fellow has been so liberal to me that I give you my word I should be sorry to hear anything had happened to him.
>
> SIR O. Not more than I should, I assure you. But the bond you mention happens to be just the worst security you could offer me—for I might live to be a hundred and never see the principal.
>
> CHARLES. Oh, yes, you would; the moment Sir Oliver dies, you know, you would come on me for the money.
>
> SIR O. Then I believe I should be the most unwelcome dun you ever had in your life.[2]

Also Joseph's second line in the following dialogue from the Screen Scene (page 63):

> JOSEPH. Now, my dear Lady Teazle, if you would but once make a trifling *faux pas*, you can't conceive how cautious you would grow, and how ready to humor and agree with your husband.
>
> LADY T. Do you think so?

[2] One reason why this passage is hard for the audience to follow is that Charles does not understand what Sir Oliver is talking about, and so cannot perform the usual function of helping the audience to understand by his own reaction.

JOSEPH. Oh! I am sure on't; and then you will find all scandal will cease at once....

And Charles's line in the same scene (page 70):

SIR P..... What I have heard has given me great satisfaction.

CHARLES. Egad then, 'twas lucky you didn't hear any more; wasn't it, Joseph?

Turning now to the much more interesting matter of those variations in response growing out of differences in the acting, we find that many laughs heard early in the week disappeared later. Not all of these losses can be explained, but a few of them, like the ones on Wednesday night, already mentioned, were undoubtedly due to errors in timing. Some errors in timing were probably inevitable, since each performance has its own rhythm, and the responses of the audience can never be perfectly anticipated, even after many performances. Others, however, grew out of rushing lines unnecessarily; a number of laughs heard Monday and Tuesday were choked off later in the week by too rapid response to cues. It is natural for actors, as they become more certain of their lines, to speed up the dialogue a little; and in general this is a good thing.[3] But now and then, in their eagerness to get ahead, they forget to wait for legitimate laughs. Sir Peter's lines in the following dialogue with Rowley (page 21) were killed in this way after Tuesday night:

ROWLEY. What can have happened since yesterday?

SIR P. A good question to a married man!

ROWLEY. Nay, I'm sure, Sir Peter, your lady cannot be the cause of your uneasiness.

SIR P. Why, has anybody told you she was dead?

ROWLEY. Come, come, Sir Peter, you love her, notwithstanding your tempers don't exactly agree.

The same thing happened to Sir Oliver's line (pages 34-35): "Mercy on me!—he's greatly altered and seems to have a settled married look! One may read *husband* in his face at this distance!"—which was killed the last couple of nights by Sir Peter's

[3] Provided, however, it is not carried to the point of interfering with "the illusion of the first time."

too hasty entrance. Also to Lady Teazle's line in the following (pages 21-32):

> SIR P. Your ladyship must excuse me *(to Lady Sneerwell);* I'm called away by particular business. But I leave my character behind me.
>
> LADY T. *(calling after him)* You'd better take it with you, Sir Peter!
>
> SIR B. Or we shall handle it most unmercifully....

Probably, also, a number of laughs were lost by the wayside through plain blundering, or forgetfulness, or accident.

As the figures show, however, more laughs were gained than lost during the week, and some of them were undoubtedly gained through improvements in the acting. The most important of them may be roughly classified as follows:

1. Laughs dependent upon the timing.
2. Laughs growing out of the effect of lines on other characters, rather than out of the lines themselves.
3. Laughs dependent upon effective "following through."
4. Laughs dependent upon contrast.
5. Laughs peculiar to the old technique in asides and soliloquies.

In the course of the five nights there were numerous improvements in the timing. Two types of improvement noticeably affected the response. The first was an improvement in the articulation of lines and action in the more rapid ensemble scenes, such as the breezy entrance of Crabtree and Sir Benjamin in Act I (page 16), the gossip scene in Act II (page 30), the auction scene (pages 56 and 57), the scene when Lady Teazle and Sir Peter are alternately peeping out from the screen and the closet (page 68), the scene in which Charles drags Sir Peter out (page 70), and the scene at Sir Peter's in Act V (pages 78 to 83), all of which built up during the week, and most of which drew more laughs on Thursday and Friday than on other nights.

The second type of improvement was in the use of pauses to bring out the laughs. In Crabtree's long speech about Miss Piper and the sheep (page 18), for example, the main laugh always came on the line, "What! cries the lady dowager Dundizzy (who, you know, is as deaf as a post), has Miss Piper had twins?" But by skilful use of several pauses the actor learned to bring out,

after the first night or two, an additional loud laugh and a half dozen chuckles on the remainder of the speech. He had a similar experience with another long speech in Act V (page 80) in which Crabtree describes the imaginary duel between Sir Peter and Charles. The audience wanted to laugh on the word, "... and wounded the postman ...," and it took careful timing to save that laugh and also to bring out the laughs on the remainder of the line: "... who was just coming to the door with a double letter from Northamptonshire. But whether or not the letter was post-paid I am quite unable to tell."

In the part of Sir Peter I also had difficulties with the timing, and was able to rescue some lost laughs late in the week by means of proper pauses. But the most interesting problem of timing I encountered was in connection with Sir Peter's last line, "And may you live as happy together as Lady Teazle and I intend to do." This drew a laugh every night, but only because it had been carefully built up in rehearsal. Instead of speaking it as printed I said, "And may you live as happy together as Lady Teazle and I!" as if that were all, the other characters gasped, whereupon I added the other three words as a hasty afterthought. I found, however, that both the reaction of the others and my own added words had to be shot over with lightning-like rapidity in order to beat out the laugh. It would not do, of course to wait for the laugh and then add the afterthought, for that would make it seem flat and studied.

Laughs dependent upon the reaction of other characters always improve with successive performances as the players grow more accustomed to their parts and begin to feel out the audience response. In rehearsal they are usually cautioned by the director against over-acting, and especially against distracting attention from the speaker by excessive by-play; and this is good sound instruction. For the very reason, however, that in a well rehearsed scene attention is concentrated upon the speaker, a slight reaction by the character addressed passed unnoticed by the audience. When his reaction is essential to point up the line or bring out its humor, it must be exaggerated at least enough to insure its being noted by the audience.

In the following bit from the first quarrel scene (page 23)

Lady Teazle's line draws no more than a slight snicker in itself, and Sir Peter's response goes unnoticed if spoken promptly:

> LADY T. Authority! No, to be sure. If you wanted authority over me you should have adopted me and not married me; I am sure you were old enough.
>
> SIR P. Old enough!—ay—there it is. Well, well, Lady Teazle, though my life may be made unhappy by your ill temper, I'll not be ruined by your extravagance.

It took me until Thursday night to find out that if Sir Peter starts violently on his cue and displays apoplectic symptoms before going on with his line the audience will laugh heartily.

In the scene in which Sir Peter greets Sir Oliver (page 35), Sir Oliver's teasing remarks concerning Sir Peter's marriage are not especially funny in themselves, but Sir Peter's apprehension of being teased *is;* and his reaction when his apprehension is confirmed can be exceedingly funny:

> SIR P. Oh! 'tis a long time since we met—fifteen years I doubt, Sir Oliver, and many a cross accident in the time.
>
> SIR O. Ay, I have had my share. But what! I find you are married, hey, my old boy? Well, well, it can't be helped—and so I wish you joy with all my heart.
>
> SIR P. Thank you, thank you, Sir Oliver. Yes, I have entered into—hem—the happy state—but we'll not talk of that now.
>
> SIR O. True, true, Sir Peter; old friends should not begin on grievances at first meeting—no, no, no.
>
> ROWLEY. *(to Sir Oliver)* Take care, pray, sir.

If Sir Peter does no more than squirm slightly on the word "married," as I did early in the week, the audience does not get half the humor of the situation; it is too busy listening to the rest of Sir Oliver's line. I found after several trials that if I first built up a kind of exaggerated lightness of manner, and then came down with a sudden panic on the word "married," showing consternation in my face and turning quickly away from Sir Oliver, the audience would laugh; also that they would laugh a second time if, after a valiant effort to resume my composure on my next line, I broke again on the word "grievances." Both effects were considerably heightened when Sir Oliver learned to pause slightly after "old boy" in his first speech, and to show a counter-reaction of amusement before saying, "Well, well, it can't be helped."

After Lady Teazle's discovery in the Screen Scene (pages 72-73) Joseph has a long, disjointed speech in which he makes a lame attempt at an explanation; one choice bit deserves a laugh, but is apt to escape attention in the general confusion of the speech. I refer to the words, "and hearing your carriage coming up the stairs—." The only way to insure the laugh is to have Sir Peter react in some way, but with Joseph at the opposite side of the stage and the attention all on him, Sir Peter's reaction must be considerably exaggerated or it will go unnoticed. I found that a sudden drawing up of the body, with a suggestion of outraged dignity, served the purpose. Sir Peter, by the way, being a rather violent sort of person, may be allowed certain exaggerations that would not be convincing in a more placid character. He is the unhappy victim of many humorous situations and much teasing, and so his reactions become an important element in the humorous intentions of the play. He draws almost as many laughs by his reception of other people's remarks as by his own lines.

The principle of "following through"—the phrase, of course, is borrowed from golf—has been much discussed in books on play production. The actor, like the golfer, is in constant danger of letting go, or letting down, too quickly after a stroke. When he does this on a line that should draw a laugh he kills the laugh. The temptation to let down too quickly is of course strongest when the line in question does not end the speech; the actor is so anxious to get on with the remainder that he does not take time to follow through. I had trouble in this respect with the following lines (page 21):

> SIR P. But the fault is entirely hers, Master Rowley. I am, myself, the sweetest tempered man alive, and hate a teasing temper: and so I tell her a hundred times a day.
>
> ROWLEY. Indeed!
>
> SIR P. Ay! and what is very extraordinary, in all our disputes she is always in the wrong! But Lady Sneerwell, and the set she meets at her house, encourage the perverseness of her disposition....

I never did get the laugh I should have had on the first line, because I did not discover soon enough how to avoid rushing on with the next line; the way, I believe, is to let the "Ay!" be part of the following through, and to make the break in thought come

after it rather than before. I did learn, before the run was over, to draw out the laugh on "always in the wrong!"—though the temptation to hurry on at that point is made very strong by the conjunction "but." The problem involved here is of course inseparable from the problems of pause and timing, already discussed.

Later in the same scene (page 22) there is another example of the same thing in Sir Peter's line "... of course no person could have more opportunity of judging of their hearts, and I was never mistaken in my life. Joseph is indeed a model for the young men of the age..." There is a good laugh in the words, "I was never mistaken in my life"—a statement that is later quoted by Rowley when he and Sir Oliver are teasing Sir Peter; but the remark about Joseph is so evidently the main business of the paragraph that one fears to jeopardize it by pointing up the preceding remark too much. By Thursday night however I found that I could follow through sufficiently to draw the laugh, without pointing up in such a way as to distract attention; and by putting a little extra force on the word "Joseph" I could keep the balance of the paragraph.

The most interesting problem in following through arose in connection with Lady Teazle's line in the second quarrel scene (page 43):

> LADY T. No? Didn't I refuse Sir Tivy Terrier, who everybody said would have been a better match? for his estate is just as good as yours, and he has broke his neck since we have been married.
>
> SIR P. I have done with you, madam! You are an unfeeling, ungrateful—but there's an end of everything....

As originally rehearsed, Lady Teazle was to say her line approaching Sir Peter, tap him on the shoulder with her fan on the last few words, and then cross behind him; while he was to cross in the opposite direction on the first part of his line. Her cross proved to be too much of a let-down, however, and the audience at the dress rehearsal refused to laugh. Fortunately we solved the problem in time for the first public performance, and Lady Teazle got her laugh every night. What she did was to face front and speak her line as if it ended on the words "just as good as yours;" then, still facing front, she flashed a sudden, mischievous laugh,

and turning toward Sir Peter, spoke the remaining words, tapping him with her fan, and following through as if to rub the idea in. Sir Peter recoiled slightly, spluttered, spoke the first part of his line without crossing, and then crossed on the interruption after the word "ungrateful," Lady Teazle holding her position until the instant of his crossing. The effect was not only to bring a hearty laugh on the end of her line, but also to keep the audience in a ripple of laughter for the next two or three lines.

Laughs dependent upon contrast, like those dependent upon the reaction of characters, seldom reach their full value in the first performances; the actors must experiment and feel out the proper shade or degree of contrast to produce the maximum effect. The actress who played Mrs. Candour for us had difficulty at first in conveying just the right sort of contrast between the assumed innocence and good nature of that character and her real tale-bearing proclivity. In her first scene (pages 14-15) she played gushingly, as of course she should, but on the first two nights she gushed through both types of lines, attempting to make the contrast by a change of pitch and tempo rather than of mental attitude, and revealing by her facial expression that she saw through her own duplicity and rather expected everybody else to do so. As a result she did not raise a laugh until she reached the line, "But Lord, do you think I would report these things? No, no! tale-bearers, as I have said before, are just as bad as tale-makers." This line is in the fifth of a series of speeches, each of which contains a choice morsel of gossip and a virtuous disclaimer of gossip, purposely contrasted by the author to reveal Mrs. Candour's character. By Wednesday night, the actress managed to make the contrast more convincing by toning down her manner and facial expression to suggest that she herself was convinced of her own innocence; as a result, she drew a laugh on the fourth line of the series, and by Friday night she had so built up the scene that she drew laughs on the second and third as well. Several of her later scenes were built up toward the end of the week in the same way.

With Mrs. Candour's lines it was a more subtle kind of contrast that brought about the improvement. With some of Sir Peter's, however, it turned out that a broader and more obvious contrast was needed. In the opening soliloquy, when Sir Peter

says, "'Tis now six months since Lady Teazle made me the happiest of men, and I have been the most miserable dog ever since!" I increased the contrast a little each night, with a corresponding improvement in response; but it was not until Friday night, when I caught my breath after "men" and completely changed my voice, manner and posture, that the audience really laughed outright.

A very similar contrast apears in Sir Peter's later soliloquy (page 44):

> SIR P. Plagues and tortures! Can't I make her angry either! Oh, I am the most miserable fellow! But I'll not bear her presuming to keep her temper: no! she may break my heart, but she shan't keep her temper. *(Exit. Curtain).*

I found it necessary to drop the voice and wilt on the words, "Oh, I am the most miserable fellow!" in order to draw the laugh, and then to recover my violence for the remainder of the line in order to build up the climax for the exit and curtain.

The example just cited illustrates also the special problem constantly met in this play of how to handle the eighteenth century asides and soliloquies. The few asides and soliloquies in modern plays—excluding the highly conventional ones of O'Neill—are meditative or exclamatory, and may be spoken into space as if the character were thinking out loud. Usually they are not very vital parts of the play. In the eighteenth century, however, the asides and soliloquies were an essential part of the exposition and of the humor, and were spoken directly, frankly, and communicatively to the audience. To alter either the lines or the general manner of delivery is to wreck the very substance of the play, and we chose to give them as the author intended. We tried to prepare our audience by distributing copies of a flier describing the play and the technique of its time. In it we defined the asides, not as a character thinking out loud, nor an actor stepping out of his part, but as a character stepping out of the play to take the audience into his confidence.

In spite of this preparation we had some difficulty at first in getting the full response to these lines. The fault was less with the audience than with the players; we were afraid, at first, to cut loose, and to address the audience in a frank and confidential manner. Sir Oliver and Joseph for example have many short asides

sandwiched in between other lines, and at first our actors were so afraid of holding up the flow of the action that they spoke these lines hastily and impersonally to the wide world, with very little effect. Later, when they learned to take more time, frankly suspending the action in order to confide in the audience, the response was much better. Among the many examples I may cite Sir Oliver's lines: "Egad, they'll persuade me presently I'm at Bengal" (page 51); "Oh, the prodigal!" (page 53); "Let me hear now who dares call him profligate!" (page 58); and Joseph's lines: "My opposite neighbor is a maiden lady of a curious temper" (page 61); "I wish it may not corrupt my pupil" (page 66); and "Certainly his coming just at this time is the cruellest piece of ill-fortune!" (page 78).

To go back to Sir Peter's soliloquy (page 44) already quoted, which comes at the end of the amusing scene in which he and Lady Teazle make up their differences only to fall at once into a more violent quarrel, we find that the speech divides naturally into three parts. On Monday night I made the mistake of speaking the part looking off stage after Lady Teazle. Then, on the words, "Oh, I am the most miserable fellow!" I turned away for my exit, then stopped and spoke the last clauses to the wide world. There was no audible response until after the curtain was down. On Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday I spoke all the lines front, but heightened the contrast between the first part and the second. The result was one good laugh each night, and it came on the contrasting clause. On Friday night I waited until Lady Teazle was well off stage, staring angrily after her; then I turned and spoke the first part of the speech confidentially—though forcefully—as if I were addressing a friend who had been in the room with me during the quarrel. I waited for their response, then wilted, spoke the words, "Oh, I am the most miserable fellow!" almost to myself as I turned away two paces, then pulled myself together suddenly and shouted the last part at the audience as if I meant to impress them with every word. That night they gave me three good laughs, one on each part of the speech.

In Sir Peter's soliloquy at the end of the first quarrel scene (page 26) my experience was so nearly identical that I may safely omit the harrowing details. The longer soliloquies of Joseph Surface likewise drew much better responses when he spoke them in

full confidence to the audience. One may choose to disapprove of the old asides and soliloquies, but I believe there can be no doubt that when they are to be retained they are best handled frankly in the old manner.

I have omitted from this discussion—with one or two exceptions—the lines that drew laughter at every performance. Many of these, no doubt, are fool-proof, like Sir Peter's immortal exclamation, "Zounds! madam, you had no taste when you married me!"—and would have been laughed at by any audience, no matter how badly spoken. Many others, however, illustrate, quite as well as the examples given, the principles of response already mentioned, and were regularly successful with us only because we were lucky enough to find out before the first performance how to manage them. I shall not weary the reader with further citations or classifications; the experienced actor or director will have covered the ground already, and the inexperienced may do so if he likes by combing through the lines of *The School for Scandal*, or any similar play, with this discussion in mind.

"O WAD SOME POWER...."*

DOROTHY J. KAUCHER
San Jose State College

AS nearly as I can find out, I am supposed to function on this program as a sort of entr'acte. The chairman seemed to feel that there should be some sort of lull in the proceedings and asked me, with admirable persuasive technique, to do what I could as an interval between the research revelations and the annual debate on speech standardization. He asked me to refer, in a light and disarming manner, to what is wrong with teachers of speech—that is, with us—a subject which, I believe, has been discussed before. I confess that I have no way of knowing what is wrong with us, but apparently something must be, of course, in order that convention program chairmen and curriculum committees may continue to operate. As an interval, all that I can really say on the subject is that I think, on the whole, I could have been of

* Paper read at the Eastern Public Speaking conference held at Princeton, April 25, 26.

more service by remaining in Aurora and finding out further what is wrong with the Wells College final plosives than I can be at a convention, holding the mirror up to nature and paging Robert Burns.

"O wad some Power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us!"

I asure you I am not playing the role of the poet's "ithers" in this case, for I am only a fellow participant, vaguely wondering, for a few moments, how we do impress the "ithers."

Introducing what has ordinarily been referred to as "oral English" or "speech" work at Wells this year has not left me in that calm, Rabindranath Tagore state of mind of the onlooker who can wisely evaluate with infinity and the stars as a background. Instead, I have found myself with a background—and a foreground—of about a hundred freshmen in one course, with diaphragms of varying muscular uncertainty and attitudes of mind which have all of that questioning fervor of youth so prized by educators. No one was quite certain what the "new" course in speech was to be like. Some thought that it was more or less related to chorus work, and an epidemic broke out among the freshmen class to the effect that if you could get admitted to the college chorus, you could automatically escape speech, the relation between the two being somewhat like that between sunlight and cod liver oil. If you take one, you do not need the other. I might add, in this connection, that my problem was increased by the fact that anyone taking chorus knew that, at least once during the year, she would have the opportunity to sing with the Hamilton College choir, whereas I could offer no such incentive when displaying my academic wares.

Older ones, interested and benevolent, outside the student body, also asked in a pleasant, social way what I anticipated doing in this course. It seems a harmless enough question, but listen to it often enough, and you feel as if a deep plot is being brewed against you. Finally, to both students and interested bystanders alike I spoke one simple sentence: I do not anticipate performing any miracles. At first, I wondered why there was such a curiosity concerning what was, after all, nothing but another course in the curriculum. Other courses are added to college curricula, apparently, without arousing any kind of public welfare league queries.

I also wondered, in some cases, why there were looks of polite and genteel disappointment when I failed to promise to produce the egg in the hat as a part of my academic bag of tricks. But after reading the description of speech courses in college catalogues at large, in a vain effort to phrase my anticipations for those who were inquiring, I decided that the questioners are not to blame if they innocently expect miracles to take place in speech courses periodically because we give them every reason to hope for the best. The descriptive product I finally evolved for the Wells College catalogue for this year is a fair sample of what I mean. It was evolved in the ebullience of a blue-gold autumn day when catalogues frequently go to press. And I have had occasion several times since, in December grayness and February thaw, both of which are more conducive to speech sanity than any graduate theses in speech have yet pointed out, to regret the buxom certainty of what I wrote. The cosmic nature of this catalogue outburst of mine, which was the result of a desire to impress my colleagues and not to serve the mind of youth, reminds me of a passage in *The Green Pastures* where God, to demonstrate the significance of an omnipotent profession, says with assurance,

> "I'll jest r'ar back an' pass a miracle. Let it be some firmament! An' when I say let it be some firmament, I don't want jest a little bitty dob o'firmament. . . .Let it be a whole mess of firmament!"

And a "whole mess of firmament" is, I think, the verdict which the bewildered reader of catalogue pronouncements might render, after any very extensive reading. Some of these pronouncements seem to be the nearest prose equivalent to the poet's hymn of thanksgiving that

> "God's in His Heaven
> All's right with the world"

that we possess.

I think that these catalogue outbursts of teachers of speech (and of those in other departments who have the honesty to admit it) can be vindicated partly on the same grounds that any parents may have for wanting their children to make as creditable a showing as possible before the world, particularly if that world happens to be inclined, at the moment, to watch the maneuvers of its new entries with the appraising eye. It seems to be necessary

at such times to step forward with pleasing assurance and to speak with reassuring finality, even when one knows that truth is seldom reached through finality. To me, there is always something disconcerting in this finality which cannot be entirely reassuring to real scientists and to real scholars, though I admit that some of it seems to be necessary in conducting a fundamentals course for college freshmen who want finality, in notebook doses, for quizzes and credit. On the whole, I believe that our well-meant and animated efforts to impress our colleagues, however, and to give to our profession what we nervously call the "proper academic stamp" are sometimes likely be misinterpreted; and rushing to the defense of whatever banners may be flying at the moment over our speech ramparts may become merely ridiculous in its desperateness.

I regret that I sound so much like a reformer, especially since what I have said may easily indicate, to one straying in from another fold of knowledge, that conditions in the world of speech and of speech teachers are indeed as deplorable as he or she had been assured they were. However, protesting against the present order of things seems to be the chief function of an "interval" of the feminine gender, as I understand the term. Anything which I have said, however, regarding catalogue outbursts, impressing one's colleagues and encouraging belief in speech faith-healing or miracles is not any attempt on my part to usurp any masculine prerogative and "throw a bomb." I insist I am still only a peace loving "interval," and I mention these matters, not to encourage those who wish to believe that teachers of speech are an academic menace, but only because all "intervals" must have subdivisions!

Another sub-division which I feel I am at liberty to introduce in my present role is the writing of speech text-books for the purpose of academic advancement in rank. I admit that the writing of these books does give employment to those of us whose only means of self-expression seems to be through book reviewing in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL. I admit, also, that one should publish, and I admit that some of the material which has been published is good. But on the whole, may we not entertain the sweetly reasonable hope that the rush hour in this multiplying of words will soon be over, that the authors will soon acquire the coveted rank and sub-

sequent suburban home with frigidaire, and that then a law can be passed that no one can write a text book on speech unless he can give proof of at least twenty years in the service. And by that time, he probably will not want to; or if he does, the chances are that what he produces will not be speech in cold storage or a pale re-wording of what some valiant pioneer has already worked out after having done considerable jolting over long roads not marked first class. Seminar papers and theses written in the atmosphere of truth which thrives in our graduate schools have their place, but at this point, I think that any reputable "interval" should pause long enough to pay a tribute to some of those of an elder day who, without much blare of trumpets, with little equipment, with nerve enough to experiment with something besides footnotes, have furnished rather ample material, directly and indirectly, for what is now being written about with such vigorous confidence by young enthusiasts with typewriters that click off well-rounded phrases and shining mechanism that does very well at times. I do not mean to minimize the work of these younger enthusiasts. I only mean that any belief that the mere acquisition of a Ph. D. degree can insure the future of speech or that the kymograph can save the situation when nothing else can is unfortunate. I have no special feeling of resentment against the kymograph. I recall watching a graduate student from the University of Oslo last summer use this instrument, and I realized then that, in the hands of an expert, it is valuable for certain kinds of research. But the chief danger in the "shining mechanism" for most of us who are merely venders of speech is that we assemble it and then do not know exactly what to do with it. Just get a kymograph, start smoking paper and saying *apa, ata* and your colleagues will know that speech is advancing with the proper scientific conservatism in your midst. But since this is an Eastern speech conference, I presume one is safe in saying that this tendency to collect elaborate mechanism is more characteristic of the Middle West! At any rate, while I shall not deny that some of the research mechanists are deserving of praise, I should like at this time to pay a tribute to this other group to which I referred,—those who have not felt the clutch of mere facts to such an extent that they are blinded to the whole truth and who have not specialized to such an extent that they have become intolerant of

other lines of work in their field. I have been particularly impressed with this fact since being at Wells. There are no speech pioneers of an elder day there, but there are those who, with a broad cultural background, possess that intangible sixth sense which I believe is essential to any real work in the oral interpretation of literature or any intelligent work in reading. They have taught more oral interpretation of literature indirectly than I have in a course that is labeled such and given a call number, This intangible sixth sense seems to be a by-product, not an end in itself, and because of that fact, it often eludes many of the more systematic of us who make out elaborate tables of content in the shadow of alphabetized notes but who miss that other value which I have found, strangely enough this year, by rather aged fireplaces unadvertised by any college publicity managers. I realize that this is a point which can easily become ludicrous, and I realize also that the picture I have drawn of these teachers, saturated with culture, sitting by firesides, might easily lend itself to caricature. But in its way it is no more absurd than too much talk about a stroboscopic disc or the charting of the measurable differences of breath control between advanced and beginning students who read *Sohrab and Rustum* as 4.6. I have the greatest respect for some of the scientific research which is being done in speech. Certainly, I did not attend the Yale Linguistics Institute without adding x-ray photographs in experimental phonetics to my speech creed. But the point which I wish to make is that one can make palatograms and measure centimeters and get records on the kymograph of the final plosives of young Portuguese on the New Haven green, and still not capture for his students a value which I consider essential, at least in the literary approach to speech work. It is something which seeps through into the consciousness of students without the aid of mimeographed outlines. I have felt the need, in my course in the oral interpretation of literature, for this intangible thing which those of that older time seem to have in some cases, in spite of the fact that they may have been living at the same time that elocution was abroad in the land. In reading some theses on speech theory, one sometimes gets the idea that anyone who was alive during that period of linguistic plague must, automatically, have fallen a victim to it, just as all living in the baroque era of architecture must have lived in baroque houses or

perished. Yet, I believe, real culture did quietly raise its heads now and then in those days and get a real nod of recognition. And that nod, at times, was and still is, just as potent as a kymograph or a laryngoscope.

In referring to the literary approach to speech work, which, I admit, is a rather vague term, I am reminded of what a writer in the Atlantic Monthly recently wrote about those two seas,—the sea of troubles and the sea of upturned faces. In speech, instead of the "seas," we seem to have the approaches,—the approach through psychology, the approach through physics, the approach through linguistics, and the approach through physiology. And to those observing us, we must, at times, present a unique appearance, in our specialized pilgrimages, perspiring along separate paths. A sectarian approach to infinity could not be more amusing to the immortal gods. I am not here referring to those who work long and vigorously in one field in order that they may contribute an atom or two of truth in the course of time to the subject in which they are working and who frankly admit, at the end, that they may not have contributed anything. I mean rather those who get one idea and ride it to death, who, from having expressed it so often, are actually convinced that through this one approach only does salvation lie, and who appeal to those who want something said to them often enough and confidently enough that they may eventually believe it. It is not easy, when one has turned to speech with the hope of finding it a more vital field of academic activity, to note the polite pity and even contempt with which open-minded and disinterested persons regard some of these persistent yaps among our fanatics. It is disheartening because, in my desire to defend my departure from English to speech, I am at a loss at times to explain in what way speech is preferable. Once I was contemptuous of Ph. D.'s in English writing on threadbare subjects; but now I know of crimes of equal magnitude which are committed in the world of speech because of distorted perspective and over-zealous flocking in partitioned areas and a sort of unbalanced belief that in only one corner can we remain and be regarded intelligent.

On the other hand, there are teachers of speech who are likely to go to the opposite extreme, in the eyes of Burns's "ithers" and instead of over-specialization, try to do as many hurdles as

possible. One summer we go out, like students in seeking credits for sports, for the physiological approach; then we try the psychological; and, God willing, we may do a turn at physics next and forever cherish thereafter our blackened records of "Peter Piper Picked a Pack of Peppers" as rendered on the kymograph by American, German, and Icelandic speakers. Thus do we check off the "approaches" on our shopping list. I started to do all three last summer because of inability on my part to tell, from the catalogue descriptions, what each course would analyze. Then I came to Wells, and like the walrus, spoke of many things. That is, I did for the first month. After that, I descended to the purely human level.

One of the chief criticisms of speech which I have heard comes from English professors. One of these men, Professor R. L. Ramsay, a former colleague of mine, maintains that teachers of speech often have an insufficiently comprehensive perspective of language as a growth. Lacking an adequate knowledge of philology, they regard language too much as a static thing which can be legislated in or out, according to the desire of a dictator or board of dictators; and thus, since, they do lack historical perspective of language, they frequently fall into dogmatic absurdity.

Perspective, in fact, is the saving grace of a teacher of speech, in my opinion. This is something which our bright and enthusiastic young theorists do not always recognize, chiefly because they have plunged too soon into the graduate mind state, assuming, for example, that secondary schools are an inferior form of life, or if not that, at least an educational activity for housing classified childhood and adolescence, not affecting their research and consequently not affecting the future of speech. They seem to feel that speech problems spring full-grown, out of the college era, like Aphrodite out of the sea. There is still not enough emphasis upon intensive speech training of the earlier years, and I think that some of us, in our smug collegiate attitudes with degrees dangling from our ears, are a bit futile,—like voices lost down the wind. What we have to say is an infinite deal of nothing in view of the actual speech situation. We capitalize upon the inherent American faith in anything that goes to or teaches in or presides over a college or university.

I have intended that, as an "interval," my viewpoint should

be disinterested and I trust that all of these protests against the existing order of things will be accepted in the spirit in which they have been given,—that of furnishing an interim for a chairman who, like you and me, knows that no real convention is complete without one. As a teacher of speech, which I presume I am, I have no solutions to offer for the various problems I have concocted. I know that I shall continue to compose catalogue outbursts to impress my colleagues, because I realize that such a procedure is a form of academic self-preservation, even for those who will not admit it. And if a publisher would print anything that I wrote about the condition of the larynx among Wells College freshmen, I am sure that I would be among the first to encourage him to do so. While I agree also with the principle that teachers of speech should be able to make a speech, I think I shall always prefer to read mine. And if I receive any prospectus advertising the "four approaches," I imagine I shall go in a pilgrimage. Above all, I shall continue to renew my faith in reading the announcements of summer schools of speech and by purchasing shining mechanisms now and then; and whenever a first class miracle or promise of a miracle comes my way, I intend to make the most of it. As a speech teacher, therefore, I know of no way to remedy what is wrong with us. But if I were the Lord Jehovah, I should create a few more of those who have no mission and yet reach into the heart of things, without the aid of the filing cabinet and the glorified card catalogue. I would make teachers of speech as wise as they are systematic and conscientious and "full of personality"; and I would allow no open season for miracles, speech faith-healing, mass production of text-books, or catalogue pyrotechnics to impress colleagues who are seldom impressed but only misinformed. Above all, I feel that I would devise some method by which we might settle, once and for all, what *is* wrong with us so that future "intervals" on convention programs will be spared the necessity of portraying mellowing teachers, full of "culture," sitting beside aged firepaces using the indirect method and putting the kymograph and all its kin to shame.

THE UNDERGRADUATE READS FROM THE POETS

H. A. WICHELNS
Cornell University

COMPETITION is still in large measure the life of intercollegiate gatherings, but far less than formerly. Almost unperceived, the intercollegiate conference or convention has risen to a place alongside the competition. The commonest conference of undergraduates is, like the conventions of older men which it imitates, severely practical. College journalists meet to compare methods, fraternity men to discuss the problems of their national organization. Practical discussion on a basis of cooperation is common to all such meetings; formal competition is discarded. Yet we must not make too much of this contrast. There are elements of similarity between competitive occasion and convention that should not be overloked: the special incentive in the prospect of a different audience, the break from routine, the excitement of travel and of new acquaintances, the glamor and bustle of a special occasion. These make the convention as interesting as the competition.

It is easy to see why the typical conference, drawn on practical lines in close imitation of the ways of the real world, should attract the student. But a certain meeting held last Spring at Smith College cannot be thus easily explained.

One pleasant evening in May there was held at Northampton an Intercollegiate Poetry Reading. It was not a contest: neither prize nor praise was publicly bestowed. It was not a conference: no one discussed ways, means, or objectives. Sixteen undergraduates (five men, eleven women), from as many colleges in New England, New York, and New Jersey, had come; some travelled seven miles, some two hundred and seventy. They read aloud what they wanted to read, subject only to a pre-arranged time limit, not too rigidly observed. Some spoke from memory; others brought their books. There were no introductions. President Neilson made a short and gracious address of welcome; the speakers rose in turn as listed on the program. The five hundred hearers included the usual elements of a college town audience. Apparently both readers and listeners enjoyed the evening immensely.

The level of taste in the choice of readings is roughly indicated in the authors: Frost, Auslander, Teasdale, Robinson, Cullen, Millay; Alice Meynell and Emily Dickinson; Shelley, Browning, Arnold, Tennyson; the Rubaiyat. How close to the student's shoulder the teacher stood at the moment of selection, there is no telling. But it was evident that these poems were being read by persons who understood them and liked them, and wanted others to understand them and like them. Except in one instance, there was nothing to suggest a worked-up rendition and an exhibition of "platform art."

What did it mean to the participants, all of whom seemed quite normal, and as likely some day to be found in Wall Street as behind the footlights? Apparently it meant primarily a chance to compare experiences of a different type from the practical, yet equally real and significant. What struck the listener most, both during the reading and in talk afterwards, was the matter-of-fact acceptance of verse and voice as an interesting part of life. Poetry, read aloud, was a worthwhile experience, which it was pleasant to extend, on which it was good to compare notes. Though the attitude of the readers for the most part was easy, natural, direct, there was, of course, a suggestion of shyness in some, of defiance in others; and at times one felt that this was an experience meeting of a new sort, and that here were testimonies more sincere and far healthier than at the old-fashioned college prayer-meeting.

These young people, it was evident, had learned to think and to feel, and to communicate their thought and feeling. With most of them, the poem and its meaning came first, as it should. Inevitably there was, fairly early on the program as it happened, a good example of the elocutionary method of former days: overdone gestures and facial expression, consciousness of self at every moment, two poems of contrasting mood and tempo chosen apparently to exhibit the reader's virtuosity rather than for any affinity of their own. But that young lady was the sole representative of the misuses of poetry. In the rest there was no systematic impersonation and little suggestion of the actor, though one reader of Browning had apparently been acting Irish parts on the stage As was to be expected, most erred on the side of subjectivity: discriminations of meaning were felt, perhaps, but not conveyed. And

for some, but by no means all, it was evident that the structure of the longer poems was harder to comprehend and control.

One noted that half the voices were bad, and reflected that college teaching may train the mind, direct the feelings, improve a good many attitudes and traits of personality, but cannot readily, under present organization, soften the voice that has rasped for ten or fifteen years, nor clarify the muffled tone that became habitual before college was thought of.

But what one felt constantly at this unusual meeting was that there was nothing unusual about it at all. It seemed to be accepted by every one as thoroughly natural and normal. Poetry is an experience. In a socialized world, we share our experiences. Where travel is easy, and intercollegiate meetings of all sorts common, why not devote one to poetry?

The meeting at Smith, managed with quiet effectiveness, successful in its main purpose, and extraordinarily charming in its attendant social circumstances, suggests that neither competition nor practicality is an essential adjunct of the intercollegiate meeting. The attraction of such meetings for the student will as readily help in developing the undergraduate's capacity for aesthetic experience.

INTERCOLLEGIATE POETRY READING
SMITH COLLEGE
Northampton, Massachusetts

May 17, 1930

PROGRAM
Part I

1 *Smith College*
Steel — Joseph Auslander
RUTH H. SCANNELL

2 *Wells College*
The Golden Falcon — Robert Tristram Coffin
Three Quatrains — Edwin Arlington Robinson
Two Lyrics — Emily Dickinson
Most Sacred Mountain — Eunice Tietjens
CATHARINE CLELAND DAVIS

3 *Dartmouth College*
Rubáiyát of Omar Khayyám — Edward Fitzgerald
C. R. CHASE

4 *Rhode Island College of Education*
Cupid and Campaspe — John Lyly
Go, Lovely Rose — Edmund Waller
Ozymandias — Percy Bysshe Shelley
Mariana — Alfred, Lord Tennyson
Opportunity — Edward Rowland Sill
CLAIRE M. MCKENNA

5 *Connecticut College*
Ulysses — Alfred, Lord Tennyson
MARGARET LELAND

6 *Radcliffe College*
The Chinese Nightingale — Vachel Lindsay
TONITA ORENA

7 *Russell Sage College*
Lyrics — Alice Meynell
Lyrics — Edna St. Vincent Millay
CAROLINE COMSTOCK

8 *Harvard University*
The Explorer — Rudyard Kipling
ROBERT HAYDON JONES

Intermission
(five minutes)

Part II

1 *Mt. Holyoke College*
Judas Iscariot — Countee Cullen
SADIE G. JOHNSON

2 *Wesleyan University*
The Road Not Taken — Robert Frost
Spring Pools
Once by the Pacific
The Bear
Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening
JOHN A. KOUWENHOVEN

3 *New Jersey College for Women*
The Forsaken Merman — Matthew Arnold
MARION L. TURNER

4 *Hunter College*
Guenevere — Sara Teasdale
Joy
MARION MILLSTEIN

5 *Amherst College*
Andrea del Sarto — Robert Browning
RICHARD G. GETTELL

6 *Pembroke, Brown University*
The Hill Wife — Robert Frost
Out—Out
ELIZABETH CONSIDINE

7 *Princeton University*

Ode to the West Wind	Percy Bysshe Shelley
Dover Beach	Matthew Arnold

DANIEL E. WALZER

8 *Wellesley College*

The Ballad of the Harp Weaver	Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ballad of the Rag-bag Heart	Marjorie Allen Sieffert
Ballad of the Wistful Lady	
Ballad of the Hurdy Gurdy	

NATALIE M. BURGGRAF

This program of poetry reading, the third that has been arranged by Mt. Holyoke and Smith, is given under the auspices of the Vox Club of Smith

---

WOODROW WILSON AS A DEBATE COACH

DAYTON D. McKEAN
Princeton University

WOODROW WILSON'S activities as a debater and orator when he was an undergraduate at Princeton and when he was studying law at Virginia have long been known. It is not so generally known, however, that during the years 1890 to 1902 when he was professor of politics at Princeton, he coached or assisted in coaching, many of the intercollegiate debate teams. He was never in charge of debating. But it was only natural that the undergraduates should go to Professor Wilson for aid and suggestions, for he had been the speaker of Whig Hall during his senior year, and by the time that he came to Princeton again, he was already a speaker of considerable reputation and a rising authority on the questions of government with which the debaters had always to deal. Besides, he was, as one of them says, a keen and kindly critic, full of "spontaneous gaiety." He did not work with all the teams, but he worked with many of them, and his methods should throw some light both on his own character and on his ideals of public speaking.

Debating in those days was taken very seriously. One of the highest honors that a man could earn was to represent his college in an intercollegiate debate. The two rival literary societies at Princeton, the American Whig and the Cliosophic societies, had

behind them more than a century of tradition in public speaking and debating, and they made every effort to place their members on the intercollegiate teams. The first debate took place between the two societies, and then the intercollegiate team was picked from these teams. The total time spent on a deabte and the importance that it had for the debaters may be seen from this statement by the Reverend N. S. Reeves, who worked under Wilson: "From the time that the subject was announced and the team finally chosen, it was something like two months to the debate. I know my cuts from classes amounted at these periods to some weeks. There was nothing but fine courtesy shown by the faculty, including Professor Wilson, when we took the time necessary to prepare." If debating has changed in the last thirty years, so has the college curriculum. Apparently the time spent on a debate varied from one to three months. In this period of preparation, the debaters sought interviews with prominent men, who were authorities on the questions they had to debate. Mr. Howard Yocum tells of interviewing Thomas B. Reed, Speaker of the House of Representatives, when debating the question of the power of the Speaker. When they debated independent action in municipal elections, they interviewed Talcott Williams, editor of the *Philadelphia Press* and Lemuel E. Quigg, the famous boss of Philadelphia.

Usually the debaters found most of the material for themselves, but one of them says that Wilson was himself a mine of information, and that he was always able to refer them to additional sources. "He was very insistent," says the Reverend R. F. Stirling, "that we read, think, write, and debate on both sides. He did his best to keep us from writing out and committing to memory our speeches as early as we wanted to. His idea was to keep us working and developing as far up to the debate as possible, with the feeling that after a speech was written out, a man's ideas became fixed." So thorough was this preparation that in one debate with Yale Mr. Kirkwood was able to point out where a Yale debater had distorted a quotation by using only parts of it.

Wilson insisted that his teams write briefs, but he did not himself put much time in on them. To quote again the Reverend Mr. Kirkwood: "Briefs were asked, but not detailed.... He assumed that we had briefs, but the brief was not formally criticised

as much as the finished product. This was doubtless a time-saving method for him, for he was a busy man."

After the team had finally been selected, there was much practice, both in going over the speeches and in debating the "scrub" team. Wilson insisted on a man's debating both sides, a method now generally abandoned. He felt that the best way to find out the strongest arguments that one's opponents might have was to try to present their case for them. So he did not insist that a man should speak only on the side in which he believed. On this point his attitude had changed since his own undergraduate days, for when he was a senior, he had refused to participate in the Lynde Prize Debate when, after the debaters drew lots, he found that he should have to defend a protective tariff.

It has commonly been assumed that Wilson could see only one side of any question—his side. It would be nearer the truth to say that he had very strong personal opinions, but that he could appreciate the arguments advanced by the other side. One incident will serve to illustrate this. I quote from Mr. William Arthur Babson: "The subject of the debate that year (1901) was, in substance, whether the Platt Amendment should be imposed upon Cuba. Princeton had drawn the affirmative, which was opposed to my youthful views. . . .Right after the Spanish War, when we had taken up arms to free our small neighbor, I felt that the splendid and ethical thing to do was to impose no restrictions whatever upon the island. So, being in doubt, I went to see Woodrow Wilson, whose judgment and advice I respected highly. Wilson told me that he also favored the negative, but that my personal opinions should be disregarded entirely, as the question was selected only for debate purposes. He grasped my hand and said, 'Do your best and you will be right; don't worry about Cuba, but Harvard'."

His strong opinions, however, often came out. When debating the merits of the Boer War, Wilson showed clearly his sympathy for the Boers. And one of his debaters says that it was known that he favored the parliamentary form of government, and his attitude was apparent throughout the preparation for the debate. In 1900 his teams were debating the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty which abrogated the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty of 1850. In these debates, says Joseph Hall Hill, his fundamental admira-

tion for the English attitude showed through. But his teams won one debate and lost one. It is worth noting that when he became President of the United States he had to deal with the same treaty which he had discussed with the debaters fourteen years previously. The treaty provided that the tolls to be charged were to be equal on vessels of all nations, but in 1912 by the Panama Canal Tolls Act Congress exempted American vessels engaged in coastwise trade from tolls. The British, properly, protested against this violation of the treaty. Elihu Root then, in the Senate, appealed to his own party to repeal the act, but Congress did not repeal it until Wilson went in person to the capital, March 5, 1914, and asked for the repeal in language which became famous: "I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence, if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure." The bill was repealed the following month.

Usually Wilson was interested only in the subject, and he left coaching the delivery to Miss Perry, then a member of the English Department. His emphasis on content did not, however, blind him to the form of his debaters' speeches. The Reverend Mr. Reeves tells of one experience: "I had written what I thought was a fine first speech. He tore it to pieces very deliberately, as he did those of the others, but in a very kind and gracious way. I went back to my room that night and worked until late revising. When we met him the next day, I recall something of an amused smile as he said, 'I guess somebody has been burning the midnight oil'." Another debater says that little sarcasm or humor was encouraged; "we were all in dead earnest, and out to win by every fair means. Our arguments were addressed to the *judges* and not to the *audience.*"

Even when considering the subject, Wilson was careful of the wording of the speeches. In his own speeches he was very particular not to use one word excessively, and he did not like his debaters to do so. One day in practice he raised the question whether a man had not used one word too often. The man in question said he "had tried to get others words, but could not think of them." At once, Wilson gave him a "string of synonyms" which might well have been used instead. The debater has, after

these many years, forgotten the word; he has not forgotten the incident. "He was," says Mr. Yocum, "a master of English, using words like pieces of mosaic. He had an unusual faculty of presenting the same idea from various points of view in order to force it home. Insensibly, some of his style and diction were moulded into my speech. It was impossible to escape some degree of imitation."

The careful wording was carried over into the preparation of the rebuttal. Rebuttals were not "canned," but thoroughly discussed in advance. Where a point had to be nicely made, the exact wording was planned. "We were drilled on getting up on the floor in his presence and answering the points offered by our own 'scrub' team. He emphasized the exact wording of the rebuttal speeches, but not fully prepared speeches. . . .The careful wording was very important. Words meant a lot to him, and he cautioned us on selecting them carefully."

The whole preparation for rebuttal was exceedingly thorough. No argument that could possibly be advanced was overlooked, and time for practice meant nothing. In addition to debating against the 'scrub' team, the debaters occasionally had moot debates against members of the faculty. Once when preparing a debate on the parliamentary form of government, the team debated against Wilson, Winthrop Daniels, subsequently a member of the Inter-State Commerce Commission, and Bliss Perry, now Professor of English at Harvard. Here, incidentally, Wilson spoke against his own convictions, upholding the presidential form of government. The rebuttals were not altogether separate from the constructive speeches; the debaters were encouraged to introduce rebuttal material wherever it was pertinent.

The teams did not always succeed in spite of all this preparation. Judges were just as fickle then as they are now. One occasion is especially worth noting. In a debate against Harvard on the parliamentary form of government, Princeton had to defend it. By this time Woodrow Wilson's opinions on the question had become pretty well known. After the debate a Senator Hawley, speaking for the other judges, said that they had no difficulty in reaching a decision; that they felt it was their patriotic duty to stop this iniquitous propaganda against the American Government, and they awarded the decision to Harvard.

Wilson made a deep and lasting impression upon the debaters. They felt that they had worked with a man whose "ability as a coach and critic was outstanding." One of them says, "It was a fine experience to come in contact with a mind like his." He never felt that debating was a contest of coaches and that he was representing Princeton; the debaters knew that such was his attitude. He was a guide and critic to their own efforts. No coach can be more.

THE RHETORICAL IMPORTANCE OF LUCAN'S *PHARSALIA*

JOHN EMPEROR
University of Tennessee

"WHEN Lucan's age is considered, it is impossible not to allow that the poem is a very extraordinary one. . . .I know no declamation in the world, not even Cicero's best, which equals some passages in the *Pharsalia.*" So Lord Macaulay wrote at the end of his copy of Lucan; no better words could introduce this brief study of the Latin poet's place in the history of rhetoric. And for two reasons in particular his place is, I think, an important one. First, of the epic poets of the Silver Age he is the most interesting and most representative;[1] secondly, among his highly rhetorical poetical contemporaries he stands preëminent for his rhetorical powers—powers so great that Quintilian in a famous passage[2] commends him as a writer more to be imitated by orators than by poets. He is, certainly, a poet particularly deserving of study by those who are interested in the interrelations of poetry and rhetoric. for a real poet (and almost a very great poet) he is,[3] yet one whose merits are so closely associated with

[1] Cf. H. E. BUTLER, *Post-Augustan Poetry*, p. 97, "Marcus Annaeus Lucanus. . . . the poet who more than any other exhibits the typical excellences and defects of the Silver Age."

[2] *Institutio Oratoria*, X, 1, 90.

[3] There have always, of course, been dissenters. Cf. Lodovico Castelvetro's *Theory of Poetry*, pp. 58-9 (tr. by H. B. Charlton, Manchester University Press, 1913): "Lucan [and] Silius Italicus . . . are to be removed from the ranks of the poets and to be deprived of the glorious title of poets for having treated in their works things already treated by the historian, or at least already happened in actual fact."

his rhetorical powers that it is through rhetoric we can best approach him.

Indeed Lucan could hardly have escaped being a rhetorician; probably never in any family has the rhetorical spirit been stronger than it was in the Annaean house, to which he belonged. His grandfather was Seneca the Elder, rhetorician himself and teacher of rhetors, the compiler of the *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae*. From him and from his books Lucan beyond question learned much. One of his uncles was the younger and greater Seneca, whose importance to rhetoric was a few years ago admirably discussed in these pages;[4] another, it is moderately interesting to remember. was the Gallio who "cared for none of those things." Born in 39 A. D., Lucan was educated at Rome at a time when the study of rhetoric was itself a general cultural training. Grandson, of a professor of public speaking, shall we say, nephew of a rhetorical philosopher and minister of state and of a provincial governor, Lucan became, of course, himself a public figure: at twenty-two he was famous alike as reciter and pleader, enormously wealthy, fashionably poetical, the favorite and friend of Nero.[5]. He harangued in the law courts, practicing the type of pleading, we may well believe, that made Persius cry out against the orator who "balanced charge against charge with smooth antitheses";[6] in the lecture room and the fashionable atrium he declaimed his poems—the early books of the *Pharsalia* among them—poems intended to be recited rather than read silently, to astonish the ears of a glittering and sophisticated audience, not to steal upon the heart of the solitary reader. But Lucan was so indiscreet as to become inordinately successful; naturally his success offended the poet-fiddler-orator Nero. Lucan was forbidden the forum, forbidden to read in public. Sulkily he withdrew to the "statued gardens" Juvenal tells us of; and there the young poet, whose career seemed over and done at twenty-four, grudgingly continued his epic.

[4] Cf. R. H. WAGNER, "A Rhetorician's Son; His Advice to Public Speakers," in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education*, June, 1925, pp. 207-218.

[5] Cf. Juvenal, Satire VII, 79-80: Contentus fama iaceat Lucanus in hortis Marmoreis.

[6] Persius, Satire I, 85-7: "Furees," ait Pedio. Pedius quid? crimina rasis Librat in antithetis, doctus posuisse figuras Laudatur.

Up to this time he had been a poet of the "salons," of the atria; a pleader in the unreal world of the schools and the highly academicized world of the forum; he had, accordingly, been moderately safe and at least potentially happy. One venture only he made into practical politics, and that venture destroyed him: he joined the Pisonian conspiracy against Nero. The conspiracy failed; Lucan's part in it was discovered; at twenty-six he opened his veins and died declaiming his own verses.

One only of his poems survives, the ten books of his unfinished epic, the *Pharsalia*. It is a poem clearly written by an orator—written to be declaimed before an admiring audience. Its purpose is to astonish and amaze; it glitters with rhetorical adornment; its speeches have the subtlety and speciousness of the schools and the clang, even the fustian, of the noisy forum. It is probably, in one sense, the most oratorical poem ever written; let us take our cue from that most excellent judge Quintilian and see what this poet, *magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus*, has of interest for later students of oratory and the history of rhetoric.

First of all, the whole poem is really a rhetorical document—eight thousand lines of special pleading. Like Tacitus, Lucan belonged in spirit to the old republican and senatorial party; he hated the empire. But he was the friend and dependent of the dangerous emperor of the hour, Nero; and it was hardly pleasant, as Juvenal grimly suggests of Domitian, to have as friend a tyrant upon whose whim hung the life of any courtier who had come to talk casually about the weather. How was Lucan to write an epic deploring the fall of the republic and yet not offend the tigerish ruler who held sway because of the republic's *débacle*? Lucan's device is an ingenious one. He is writing the story of the struggle between Pompey and Caesar; Caesar as the founder of the empire he abominates; Pompey as the champion of the Senate he reveres. He begins, therefore, by lamenting the civil wars and their issue in servitude to Caesar; terrible, he says, is the devastation they have wrought. But all their carnage, their destruction alike of life and liberty, is justified, more than justified—they have led to the accession and glorious reign of Nero! He goes further: he fixes upon one Domitius, a partisan of Pompey and an ancestor of Nero; him Lucan lauds as one of Caesar's most valorous and lofty-minded opponents. But it was unfortunately true that

whenever Domitius had fought he had been beaten—invariably. The poet is hard put to it to make Domitius heroic and has to atone for lack of deeds by abundance of rhetoric. One example will suffice. Pharsalia is lost; Domitius lies dying on his last battle-field, beaten, as usual. But Lucan is not beaten. "Nowhere ever did Pompey's fortunes go to ruin—without Domitius"—praise that does infinite credit to his adaptability, and, I hope, to his sense of humor. Such, then, in its broad outlines is the *Pharsalia*, the poem of a pleader whose purpose is to reverse by words the issue of Pharsalia, to discredit the founder of the empire, and yet to conciliate and flatter the reigning emperor. For this reason alone the poem must be interesting to the student of rhetoric; to make a rough analogy, it is as if in our own day a poet of high genius (for on Lucan's possessing genius it is well to insist) were to take Cornwallis for hero and Washington for his wicked but successful antagonist—and yet wish to retain the favor of—let us say—the mayor of Chicago. In his attempt Lucan was but partially successful. Try as he will, the worse will not appear the better cause: Caesar towers high; Pompey will not become heroic. On the other hand, Nero seems to have regarded the poem without hostility. Briefly, there is no other poem of the epic grandeur and poetic power of the *Pharsalia* which is also an elaborate and partisan plea for a vanquished school of political thought.

Rhetorical, then, the *Pharsalia* is in intent; it is also highly rhetorical in form. At the risk of being bleakly statistical, it may be useful to note that of its 8160 lines, by my computation 2310 are devoted to direct discourse, and 1284 of these are found in formal speeches, many of them highly elaborate, delivered on occasions of high moment. Lucan's speeches he puts into the mouths of real historical characters: Caesar harangues his troops before crossing the Rubicon; the mutinous legionaries send emissaries to their commander; in Pompey's camp in Thessaly Cicero rises to urge the dilatory general to battle. Herein consists another element of Lucan's importance to the student of oratory: unlike his great epic forbears Homer and Vergil, unlike his contemporaries Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus, he rejects supernatural machinery: in Lucan the reader hears, not, for example, Juno objurgating Jupiter, but, let us say, the Egyptian

minister Pothinus persuading the court of Ptolemy to betray the fugitive Pompey. "Like the speeches in the plays of Seneca," says Butler, "they [Lucan's speeches] are little more than glorified *suasoriae*. . . .such speeches as. . . .no human being outside a school of rhetoric could have uttered." But such speeches they are (only vastly better) as were uttered in the schools of rhetoric, speeches suited in the highest degree to the taste of cultured audiences, speeches, finally, framed by a young orator of a very high order of genius. To neglect Lucan, therefore, is to neglect the best extant speeches of the period of Quintilian.

What, we may now inquire, are the most notable characteristics of Lucan's rhetorical gift? He excels, first of all, in that art dear to the orator of the Silver Age, the making of *sententiae*, the striking off of the terse and weighty epigram. For this quality, his abundant store of "grave sentences," he was, in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, most valued. Excellent many of Lucan's *sententiae* are: "Of their own weight things mighty fall; such limits to prosperity the gods have fixed" (I, 81-2); "Those whom guilt joins it makes equal" (V, 290). Lucan's power of compression is particularly notable; this last *sententia*, deeply pregnant as it is, he frames in four words: "Facinus quos inquinat aequat." Lucan's ability in producing *sententiae* we find at its best in the speech of Pothinus, already noted—a veritable cluster of Machiavellian epigrams: "The pursuit of virtue itself," he begins, "makes many apear guilty. Your lauded loyalty brings punishment, when it upholds the unfortunate. Yield to the fates and the gods; cherish the fortunate, flee from the wretched. Far as the stars from the earth, as the nature of flame from the nature of water, is the right from the expedient," and so on (III, 484-535). In this devotion to the sententious saying, Lucan followed, of course, the rhetorical fashion of the day; he merely made better *sententiae*—much better, at any rate, than any I have discovered in his grandfather Seneca's commonplace book of flowers of oratory. The *sententiae* are the usual bid for the audience's favor; as he ends with a sounding phrase, we can sense the carefully calculated pause for the plaudits of the jeweled hearers.

Others of Lucan's rhetorical devices I shall touch upon only briefly, merely to indicate his relation to the prevailing style of the day. He makes frequent use of antithesis—"The cause of the

victor pleased the gods; the cause of the vanquished, Cato," I, 128; "O'er all the world, Caesar, you have conquered, your armies, perished," V, 266-7. He loves the concise phrase, even when concision involves loss of clearness; thus he writes, "Vix odisse vacat"—"Scarcely had they time to hate" (III, 103). Exaggeration—in many instances, gross exaggeration—Lucan delights in. His defamation of Caesar he sustains by constant overstatement, *e. g.*, "More it pleased him to batter down gates than to enter them when open" (II, 443-4); but this extravagance of statement is found everywhere, as when he declares that at one moment a storm-tossed vessel touched the clouds with its sails, and the next grazed the bottom with its keel (V, 642)! Since Pharsalia, he declares, the world has been depopulated: not enough men can be found to garrison walls or till fields (VII, 400 ff.). Yet in that battle probably not more than seventy-five thousand men were engaged. Closely akin to this flair for the extravagant statement is Lucan's interest in the horrible, sometimes the revolting—a predilection justly accounted for by Nisard, who says that the ugly has always more superficial variety and lends itself more readily to the striking detail than does the attractive.[7] To take only random examples, the sea battle near Marseilles (III, 567 ff.) and the account of the arrival of Cato's army at the fountain of venomous reptiles (IX, 607 ff.) must remain, I suspect, notable *loci classici* for the dramatic description of terrible forms of death.

Briefly to sum up Lucan's stylistic qualities, it may be said that his prime virtue consists in being highly ingenious; his worst vice, in his tendency to be *too* ingenious. He has a morbid fear of being dull; and in large measure (save in his tedious epic catalogues and pseudo-philosophical digressions) he escapes dullness. Compared with Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus, even with Statius, he positively coruscates. But he is always straining after effect, always striving to produce the striking *mot*, the trenchant phrase; we admire, but after a time grow weary. Sometimes his very desire for brilliance leads him into absurdity, sometimes into incomprehensibility. In his determination never to nod, as Horace says even Homer sometimes does, he falls into the unpleasant habit of keeping awake by spasmodic and disturbing jerks.

It has been already noted that Lucan's poetical declamation

[7] J. M. NISARD, *Poëtes latins de la decadence*, II, p. 213.

has definite correspondences with the examples of scholastic and forensic oratory found in Seneca the Elder's *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*. Thus in the second book of the *Pharsalia* in a speech of forty-two lines Brutus urges Cato to join the army of Pompey; in a speech of thirty-eight lines Cato points out why he thinks he is serving the republic best by taking part in the struggle (II, 242-283, 286-323). The very atmosphere of the schools is here: we can hear the proposition put, Would Cato serve the republic best by joining Pompey or by remaining neutral? and in imagination hear the young orators rise to maintain each his side. We know, from Juvenal's witty diatribe, for example (Satire VII, 162-4), that one of the stock subjects of the schools was to discuss whether or not Hannibal should press on directly from Cannae to Rome; so in the *Pharsalia* we listen to two long speeches, one by Pompey, the other by Lentulus, on the comparative advisability of Pompey's withdrawing into Asia or seeking refuge in Egypt (VIII, 262-327, 331-453). As a concluding example of the point at issue, we learn from Seneca's books that one of the popular display pieces of the orators of the day was the elaborate description of the ocean in a storm;[8] in Lucan, as we have already noted, this subject is treated at length. A profound and valuable study might be made of the various rhetorical elements in Lucan by comparing his methods with those detailed in the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*. Such a study has been made of Juvenal;[9] Lucan would repay investigation even more richly.

It would be scanting my task a little to bring this discussion to a close without presenting some specimen of Lucan's rhetorical power. One passage of the *Pharsalia* I would offer as earnest of his further excellences; translated it is, yet perhaps, even so, the translation may give some impression of the qualities which led Macaulay to couple it in thought with the finest portions of Cicero. It is the valediction which Cato delivers when he hears of the death of Pompey (IX, 190-214):

> A citizen he died, though in reverence for civil rights a citizen far inferior to our sires—useful still in these days of ours, when reverence for right is dead. Powerful he was, yet

[8] SENECA, *Controversiae*, VIII, Sixth Controversy. Ed. of H. J. Müller, p. 367.

[9] JOSUE DE DECKER, *Juvenalis Declamans, étude sur la rhétorique déclamatoire dans les satires de Juvénal*, Ghent, 1913.

> liberty was safe; a private citizen, among a nation anxious to be slaves; the ruler of the senate, but of a senate that still ruled. Nothing by right of arms did he demand; he wished to receive only what might safely be denied. He possessed vast wealth, but more he gave away. He took up the sword, knowing when and how to put it down. Arms he preferred to the robe of peace, but even in arms 'twas peace he loved, for power assumed pleased him not more than power laid down. Chaste was his home and free from excess, corrupted never by the great fortunes of its lord. To the nations of the earth he has bequeathed a fair and venerable name, and great is the glory he has left our city....O happy man, whose final day found him as soon as he was first vanquished; to whom the guilt of Egypt's king brought swords that should be sought! But happy most of all for this, that, had he lived, he might have been able to bear the infamy of life under the tyranny of Caesar: The happiest lot of man is to know how to die of his own desire; the next happiest, to be forced to perish.

The influence of Lucan has not, so far as I know, been properly investigated; great it certainly has been. During the Middle Ages he was recognized as being next in the epic tradition to Vergil; Dante included him unquestioningly in the number of the great poets. So late as 1493 the scholarly Sulpitius could couple the names of Lucan and Vergil as equally great.[10] In the formation of the sententious style of the Elizabethan period he had certainly an important share. The *Civil Wars* of Samuel Daniel, to take a random example, have their prime exemplar in the *Pharsalia;* Daniel, we learn, was known as a devoted "Lucanist."[11] Marlowe's "mighty line" probably owes much to the influence of Lucan's rhetoric; the English poet translated the first book of the *Pharsalia.* Milton, of course, knew Lucan's epic;[12] how much the example of the earlier poet influenced him is, at least, a matter, of interesting speculation. Lucan was vastly admired at the universities;[13] and in the highly rhetorical poetry of the latter part of the seventeenth century he was surely an influence: Dryden's

[10] *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "Lucan."

[11] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, IV, p. 159.

[12] Cf., for a probable borrowing, *Paradise Regained*, IV, 70:

> Syene, and where the shadow both way falls,
> Meroe, Nilotick isle. . .

with the *Pharsalia*, II, 586-7:

> . . . Calida medius mihi cognitus axis
> Aegypto atque umbras nusquam flectente Syene.

account of the sea-flight in the *Annus Mirabilis* certainly derives, to my mind, from Lucan's account of the battle near Marseilles, already noted; and a fruitful study might be made, I suspect, of the influence of Lucan's rhetoric upon the inflated declamatory speeches of the English heroic drama. On the continent the French classical dramatists, Corneille most of all,[14] found Lucan a useful model. Indeed, in reading such a speech as Cornelia's farewell to Pompey (V, 762-790), the reader almost involuntarily transposes the verses into the familiar declamatory movement of the French alexandrine, so much have they in common. With Macaulay's estimate of Lucan's rhetorical powers I began this paper; Macaulay, I suspect, was thinking of Lucan primarily as a framer of glorious declamation: but Shelley, we may be sure, was valuing him as a poet when he wrote, "I have also read the four finest books of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, a poem, as it appears to me, of wonderful genius and transcending Vergil."[15] In each instance the enthusiasm of their natures swept Lucan's admirers too far; but certain it would seem to be that the poet-declaimer who could arouse such responses from a great poet and a great rhetorician is an author worthy of study by those to whom rhetoric and poetry are alike objects of interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(This list is suggestive merely—in no sense complete)

A. E. HOUSMAN, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri Decem*, Oxford, 1926.

J. D. DUFF, *Lucan* (with an English translation), Loeb Library, London, 1928.

C. E. HASKINS, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia* (with an Introduction by W. E. Heitland), London, 1887.

EDWARD RIDLEY, *The Pharsalia of Lucan translated into Blank verse*. London, 1896.

H. T. RILEY, *The Pharsalia of Lucan* (translated). Bohn translations, London, 1853.

H. E. BUTLER, *Post-Augustan Poetry from Seneca to Juvenal*. Oxford, 1909.

W. C. SUMMERS, *The Silver Age of Latin Literature*, ch. II. London, 1920.

RUDOLFS FAUST, *De Lucani Orationibus*. Regimonti (Königsberg), 1908.

[14] Cf. KARL JOHANNES ARTHUR LIFFERT, *Der Einflus der Quellen auf der dramatische Schoffen Pierre Corneilles in der ältesten Römertragödien*, Langensalza, 1913.

[15] ROGER INGPEN, *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, I, p. 446.

SPEECH PROBLEMS AT HUNTER COLLEGE

HENRIETTA PRENTISS
Hunter College

WE have no speech examination for entrance to Hunter College. Moreover, a student who has fulfilled the necessary academic requirements may receive her A. B. even though her voice and speech are unsatisfactory. It is the feeling of the college that there are fields of research and scholarship to which such a graduate may devote her energies without penalization because of foreign accent or other departure from acceptable English speech. I am not opposed to this sentiment for I myself have worked as a student under college faculties, some of whose most brilliant and stimulating members were not models of voice or speech. I had arrived at sufficient maturity to recognize that a scholar's contribution to world thought did not guarantee his taste in neckties or his mastery of public address.

At the same time, Hunter records show that a considerable number of our graduates become teachers in the elementary or secondary schools of New York. This places a distinct obligation upon us. In the elementary schools, if a child accepts a teacher at all, he accepts him for all that he is. The class room is frequently the first, too often the only place, in which the child may hear a lovely and a cultured speech used to invite his soul and his will to best endeavor. In the elementary schools, good speech, and above all good voice, is vital to successful teaching; in the secondary schools, hardly less so.

It becomes therefore the duty of the Speech Department in college to provide our students with the ability to hear speech with discrimination and the capacity to speak as mature, sensitive, educated, cosmopolitan people do when they have something to say and are interested in the people to whom they are saying it.

I use the word "capacity" with intention. Speech is as variable as the sky on an April day. Swear there is not a cloud to be seen, and before you turn away, a cloud comes racing. Voice varies as the mood varies and to a considerable extent speech also adapts itself to the mood and to the auditor. In their homes, students will modify their speech without hesitation if the standard they achieve at school proves a barrier to comradeship. I

think their instinct is right although in nine cases out of ten improved speech is acceptable everywhere if with improvement the individual retains humility and kindliness. After all, improved speech is not a legitimate basis on which to establish social superiority or to erect crusade for the betterment of relatives and neighbors. In the class room teachers of speech may be militant; in the schools, the young people may have Better Speech Clubs; but good speech at large gains its adherents through unconscious example more often than by arrogant interference.

On the other hand, it is a sorry experience for anyone to find himself in an economic or a social environment where good speech is expected and to be unable to swing into line without awkwardness or self consciousness. Here lies the joint responsibility of the school, as an educator and an employer. The school must teach its children to speak well and it must demand of its teachers good speech. To Boards of Examiners and to every superintendent, principal, assistant principal, or head of department who establishes a high standard of voice and speech in the schools and who holds the teachers to it, the colleges owe sincere thanks, just as I think the schools owe the colleges thanks for our labor in season and out to awaken our students to the value of good speech, to enable them to acquire it, and to provide them with the courage to use it.

At Hunter we receive occasional suggestions that we excuse all students from speech requirements who show reasonably good voice and speech conditions at entrance. I think Hunter has been wise in insisting that such students should be preëminently the ones to be given speech training so that they may add to their natural aptitude for good speech, a conscious knowledge of the factors underlying and controlling normal voice and speech. All our students must therefore take six hours of required work, in addition to which students with special needs are referred to optionals when their programs will permit or to clinical assistance when pressed for time.

Our required work consists of ear training, voice and speech training, with such use of the symbols of the International Phonetic Association as helps to sharpen ears and to record impressions; and drill in carrying over from conscious control into the automatic level, good habits of voice and speech through the various

mediums of expression—reading, recitation, and informal public address.

Our optionals fall into three groups—methods courses, technical courses, and art courses in Story Telling, Acting and Advanced Reading.

We meet many problems. One is the question of the standard of speech to be employed. We recognize a number in good use in America but practical necessity makes us set up the aphorism that where there must be careful and constant correction of speech, time will be saved if all the corrections conform to one standard agreed upon by all the staff and reasonably well demonstrated in their own speech.

Underlying the choice of the standard of speech to be accepted by us are the following principles:

1. The standard must be not an idealized form but one used by non-professional people for practical purposes.

2. It must be cosmopolitan; that is, recognized in all parts of the English speaking world as a dialect in good use and free from conspicuous localisms.

3. It must be fluent; that is, the word must be subordinate to the thought with such weakening of unimportant words as shall allow for a proper rhythm of speech, and such linking of words as the thought demands.

4. It shall promote openness of tone passage and physiological ease of utterance through the use of open vowels as far as is consistent with actual usage.

Another problem is the tendency to over-emphasize the importance of specific pronunciations of words, a tendency not confined to teachers of speech, the passion for asking students to shift from one allowable pronunciation to another out of personal whim. Anyone conversant with Paragraph 277 in the Guide to Pronunciation in the Introduction to Webster's New International Dictionary is apt to refrain from dogmatism in the pronunciation of debatable words and to put his stress on the achievement of a good speech form, knowing that intelligent pronunciations will be added. Of course with the little fellows in the primary grades speech form and pronunciations are much more closely allied than in college.

If the right of a word to two pronunciations must be allowed,

with a third one sometimes thrown in for the confusion of the conscientious as in "drama," how much more must a sliding scale of values be insisted on in the teaching of a good speech form. There is no subject in the world where idealism tempered with common sense is more needed than it is in speech. To make a lisper say k l à s when it is all he can do to say k l ă s seems to me the height of folly. Yet I should expect every one of my students in a class in advanced interpretation to use "Stage English," "Received English," "Standard English," (whatever title tells the tale), simply, and without self consciousness.

Problems throng in upon me. An occasion like this opens the gate to their attack. Such a meeting is an answer to one of our problems, the isolation in which we have all worked. I count it a privilege as well as an honor to be here tonight, learning the measure of the task we are all facing and the means with which it is being met. I wish we might have some similar way of interpreting our work to our academic fellows.

A vital need for effective teaching of Speech and Voice is a throat and nose clinic manned by doctors who are keen in matters of voice as well as of vocal cords, in matters of resonance as well as sinuses, doctors such as are connected with opera houses and schools of acting, of high standing in the medical profession who know not only healthy organs but healthy and beautiful functioning. To these I would add a corps of trained psychiatrists.

I shall end with two pleas. One is for more teachers trained in the technique and art of speech, whether for the elementary schools, the high schools or the colleges. The voice is a most delicately directed function, its capacity for injury from ignorant direction appalling. The teacher whose only technique is to say "louder, please," and "louder" or "don't run your words together" is a menace.

My other plea comes strangely after this technical talk. It is a plea for speech as an Art in the schools. I do not believe the sole function of speech is to be handmaid to the purveyors of facts, with intelligibility alone its necessary attribute.

"Doubtless right language enlarges the soul as no other power on influence may do. Who, for instance, but trusts more nobly for knowing the full word of his confidence? Who but loves more penetratingly for possessing the ultimate syllable of his tenderness?"

THE ETHICS OF PERSUASION

(A DEFENSE OF RHETORIC)

WILLIAM SCHRIER
University of North Dakota

THE distrust of persuasive methods in speech has been perennial. Artifice, sophistry, exploitation, demagoguery,—these and similar opprobrious epithets have been freely hurled in condemnation of appeals to the emotions. In an age of high-pressure salesmanship, questionable advertising, commercialized evangelism, and emotional jury appeals, the interest in this chronic problem of the ethics of persuasion is again as acute as ever. In view of its renewed current interest, it may be interesting and worthwhile at this time to restate our position as teachers of speech.

What those who condemn rhetoric and rhetoricians fail frequently to realize is that speech is a tool, and that it may therefore be both used and abused; it may be employed in worthy causes or toward evil ends. Not one among us will deny that there is such a thing as false persuasion. We know that the human race is far from perfect,—that some speakers are unscrupulous, and that many auditors are susceptible to low motives. But what it is exactly that constitutes false persuasion, of what stuff it is made, how to distinguish it from true persuasion—that is something else again! We hesitate to lay down dogmatic rules.

In his efforts to discourage false persuasion, and to see that the tool of speech is employed on the side of right and justice, it is logical for the conscientious teacher to inquire: Is there not a definite line or boundary at which we can say the legitimate appeals in speech-making stop and the illegitimate begin? Can we not as teachers develop a professional Code of Ethics which will aid in detecting right from wrong? Is persuasion not reducible to definite rules of conduct whose observance we as teachers shall urge, and whose transgressions, condemn? In short, can we not locate the point where "recognizing human characteristics" becomes "pandering to human weaknesses"?

The answer to these questions is no. Persuasion ethics is general ethics. There is no separate standard of ethics for public speakers; each case of persuasion must be judged in the light of

the particular instance, and according to the prevailing standard of ethics of the community or of the individual.

This answer is not a new one. It has been given many times before by present-day leaders in our profession. What I intend to do is merely to show how the charges of false persuasion arise, to point out the difficulties that beset us all along the way in our research for a norm, and hence to explain why the old answer is the correct one.

In our effort to determine the line or boundary for the right and wrong of persuasion, it will surely be admitted as a starting point that emotional appeals *per sē* are not unethical. We know that studying the prospective audience, and talking in terms of the understanding, needs, and interests of that audience is not only justifiable but wise. And when we do thus analyze any audience and apply that analysis to our speeches, we know that the feeling of auditors, as well as their reasoning powers, must be taken into account. Man likes sometimes to think of himself as an exclusively reasoning animal. But it is a patent fact that audiences are not moved to accept a course of conduct merely by having a reason presented for it.

We cannot, in answer to our questions, lay down this dogmatic rule: Appeals to emotions are wrong, in and of themselves. To decry and to deplore them intrinsically, as some extreme opponents of rhetoric appear to do, is to attack the state of human nature itself. If a line or boundary can be found, it must be in the manner in which these emotional appeals are employed.

Turning then to methodology, let us analyze hastily some of the outstanding ways from which charges of false persuasion chiefly arise, and at the same time see how difficult is the problem of finding such a line or boundary as we are seeking.

Take the case of hostile audiences. Here the effort to get a hearing, and, in the process of doing so, establishing common grounds, often results in methods that the opponents of rhetoric are over-quick to condemn. Before a hostile audience can be persuaded, it must be rendered in a mood willing to listen. In so doing, flattery is indulged in frequently. Flattery, according to my dictionary, means "insincere praise." Consider the ramifications of our difficulty! Is tactful praise all right but is flattery to be tabooed? When does the one change over into the other?

Or is flattery all right, within limits? If so, what are those limits? Does the right use of persuasion depend upon whether or not the speaker means at least a part of what he says, even if not the whole? Must we seek mathematical limits and say flattery or praise—call it what you will for the moment—is justified only when the speaker means at least fifty-one percent of the things said in that connection? Is the ethics of the situation altered by the fact that an audience may in one case "see through it" and in the other be carried away by it? Would one consider Beecher's Liverpool speech, one of the greatest oratorical triuuphs of all time, reprehensible for its subtle and tactful use of flattery? These queries solve no problems; they do raise some and show how narrow the gap can be between the right and the wrong in persuasion.[1]

Appeals to the emotions, in themselves not reprehensible, should be made indirectly. Like good gestures and good neckties, they should not call attention to themselves. They should be judiciously intermingled with appeals to reason. It is a mistake to suppose that these appeals to the emotional nature of the audi-

[1] My interest in the problem of the ethics of persuasion was stirred by once being a neutral member of a hostile audience. It was during a debate on companionate marriage between Judge Ben Lindsey and Burris Jenkins, noted pastor of Kansas City and author of the newspaper syndicated column, "The Drift of the Day." The fact that the debate was held in the home town of the Judge, under the auspices of The Thinkers Club, an organization of college students for the promotion of the free and open discussion of all current questions, led me to suspect the audience would be slightly prejudiced against Jenkins. My suspicion was confirmed when the applause that greeted Judge Lindsey, who spoke first, both before and after his speech, was thunderous.

The handling of his audience by Jenkins on this occasion was masterful. Out of a fifty-minute speech, fully twenty minutes were devoted to introduction. He observed all the rules which good rhetoricians suggest. He complimented his opponent for his sincerity; praised the good work he had done in his capacity as Judge of the Juvenile Court. He jokingly referred to the fact that Mrs. Jenkins had feared for his safety in leaving home. He told the audience that he had told her the temper of Americans everywhere was such that they welcomed a sane discussion of both sides of every public question. He complimented the audience upon the climate in which they lived, the beautiful scenery, and asserted that when he was ready to settle down, he hoped to come to live among them in this beautiful spot. Subsequent events showed that he had won his audience. What was unethical in what he said? Was anything unethical about it?

ence are of necessity irrational, that they contradict the appeal to the reason. On the contrary, one of the best ways of appealing to the reason is by means of the appeal to the emotions. I rather like the way Campbell puts it, when he says: "These are not the supplanters of reason, or even rivals in her sway; they are her handmaids by whose ministry she is enabled to usher truth into the heart and procure it there a favorable reception."[2]

In their haste to attain their end more directly, some speakers appeal to the emotions alone to the exclusion of sound argument. Witness the stump speeches of our old-time politicians. They fail to employ the judicious fusion of the intellectual and emotional elements. Especially is this true when an audience is aroused to the crowd state. Crowds are of course a matter of degree. I am thinking of the kind that is moved largely by mass suggestion, that not only likes but insists upon dogmatism of language, overstatement, and emotional presentation.

Charges of false persuasion naturally arise from this source. For in such cases what is the usual result? When speakers indulge with temporary success in the emotional appeal, and when in the process or soon afterwards they are detected by the auditors, the latter grow suspicious and resentful. They have the feeling they have been deluded, "taken in," and, like many an evangelist's backsliding convert, they feel resentful.

But before proceeding further, it should at this point be observed that the answer to our questions is not: Appeals to emotions are wrong when the audience recognizes them as such,—either because they are not covertly made or because not in judicious combination with appeals to reason. An intelligent audience will be quicker than an ignorant one to detect and to resent such types of appeals. There is of course the temptation on the part of unscrupulous speakers to take advantage of ignorant auditors, and to fail to show connections which a more intelligent group would insist upon. On the other hand, even scrupulous speakers may innocently omit appeals to reason. They may not see the need for them for the particular audience they are facing, and yet withal be quite sincere and ethical.

If the audience detects appeals of this type, it merely goes to show that the speaker has improperly analyzed his audience,—

[2] *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Bk. I, Ch. vii.

usually that he has not credited them with the proper degree of education, or at least for some reason has failed to conceal his art. But there need not be anything inherently unethical about the methods of such an inefficient speaker; his injudicious wielding of the tool of speech may mean merely that his methods have proved to be inexpedient and unwise, not necessarily unethical. In other words, the discernibility by the audience of the improper technique of persuasion is not the test of whether or not a speaker has indulged in false persuasion. True art conceals its art, and it may merely show that the speaker is not an artist, not that he is a liar, a fraud, and a hypocrite!

After all, isn't it all a subjective matter which varies with different individuals. We see parallels of this subjective situation in fields other than speech. I have seen some members of a movie optience disgusted with the palpable appeals to emotions as depicted by the heaving bosom of some prominent cinemactress (apologies to TIME) while others were giving free vent to their empathetic responses and enjoying to the full the emotional debauch (my subjective reaction, you see!) I have seen some college students aroused to the booing point by John Gilbert's performance "One Glorious Night" while others after the same performance still swore by him as the world's premier lover. And I have myself been thrilled at one time by hearing Al Jolson's "Ma-ha-ha-ha-ha-am-am-y" while at another time his frantic appeals to the memory of mammy left me as cold and unresponsive as a mummy.

And speaking of subjective reactions, frequently the nature of the subject-matter of persuasive discourse, i. e. matters which seek to affect conduct and action, add to the difficulty of determing exactly what is and what is not, false persuasion. R. Dodge illustrates well what I mean: "An appeal to the emotions may be sinister or it may be benevolent," and then he adds: "Whether it is regarded as one or the other will often depend on the point of view of the judge rather than the absolute content of the appeal."[3] The nature of absolute truth is not known to us mortals.

[3] Article, The Psychology of Propaganda, in *Kimball Young's Source Book for Social Psychology*, p. 786.

Cf. "We attribute them [sophistical arguments] readily to any persons or arguments when for any reason our approval has not been won.

Hence, in persuasion concerning future conduct, we must frankly deal in probabilities, for truth on controversial questions is in process of discovery. Of such questions, Patrick Henry has well said in his well known Call to Arms, "Different men often see the same subject in different lights." Consider the present divergence of opinion concerning prohibition. And yet both sides employ persuasion to win converts to their side. And who is to be the judge to say the one is honest persuasion and the other false?

Indeed, on controversial questions, it is difficult for men to practise Sir Roger de Coverly's judicial attitude: "There is much to be said on both sides." For it is so easy to impugn the motives and methods of those who hold and present views differing from our own. Voltaire's broadminded attitude is beyond the reach of most of us when in writing to Rousseau, he said: "I disagree thoroughly with what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it."[4] Evidently, Voltaire would not allow his own views to obscure his judgment of Rousseau's motives, nor would he have accused the latter of false persuasion in publicly advocating his views. There are some men in the body politic who can admire and respect such characters in public life as the late Senator La Follette and the very much alive Senator Borah, disagree thoroughly with some of their known views, and yet not seek the easy way out by charging them with false persuasion. And we may venture our belief at this point that those who have this ability to see both sides without impugning motives are to be found in larger numbers among teachers of persuasion who, particularly in coaching debate, come to realize the debatable nature of public questions, than among their accusers who attack rhetoric and rhetoricians as unworthy.

Herein, then, lies another reason for the difficulty of determining the right and wrong persuasion, and also another reason for the unjustified attacks upon rhetoric. A speaker who espouses a cause may be shown by subsequent events to have been dead

An argument which we do not accept is sophistical, and the person who presents it is a sophist. An appeal to the feelings of men which does not happen to warm our own hearts is rhetorical, and its author a rhetorician." E. L. HUNT, 1st article, *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of J. A. Winans*, p. 3.

[4] Quoted by WILL DURANT, *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 271.

wrong, but may not his moral principles still be high if he pleads for the right, as he sees it?

Perhaps someone at this point shouts: "Eureka! We have at last stumbled onto a solution to our troublesome questions. The right and wrong test is not whether or not a speaker is telling the truth, but whether or not he *thinks* he is!" With this in mind, we can set up two rules for guidance, answers for the time being to our original questions. Both these rules receive support from rhetoricians, ancient and modern.

1. Be sincere, do not lie; do not simulate a feeling which is not genuine; be yourself persuaded of the course to which you would persuade others;

2. Do not appeal to base motives and prejudices.

As general principles for guidance, our two rules are sound. But like all rules, they are subject to exceptions. It is an open question if even these two rules are to observed religiously at all times and everywhere. Is it not quite generally conceded that the end *sometimes* justifies the means? Do not "circumstances alter cases"?

Winans, for example, points out the difficulties in deciding the right and wrong of persuasion when he says: "Only very exceptional circumstances, if any, justify appealing to unworthy motives, but any proper motive which is operative with the audience, may be appealed to. Some hard questions arise. Would you play upon a man's avarice to save him from drunkenness? His hatred of a rival? May one ever properly appeal to a prejudice. It is very difficult to decide what beliefs and feelings are prejudices. Certainly some of our best sentiments are due to inheritance rather than reason; as our sense of honor. One may have a prejudice, an 'unreasoning predilection' for the right course as well as for the wrong. Suppose that you were dealing with a mob bent on murder; would you play upon their desire for plunder in another direction?"[5]

[5] *Public Speaking*, p. 197.

"No honest man will ever wish to form a mob; but he may wish to know how to check an audience which threatens to fall into the mob state, because it has been wrought upon by another, or because it has met in time of panic. . . . The first attempt of the one whose audience shows signs of 'running away with him' is to make himself its leader. To do this, it may be necessary to seem to fall in with its spirit and purpose,

Having made the assertion that our standard rules may at times be broken, because the end sometimes justifies the means, we get into still deeper water by this consideration: Men may differ as to just when the point has been reached that the end justifies the means!

Perhaps the tremendous difficulty of arriving at a norm for the ethics of persuasion, can be shown in no better way than the fact that most attacks upon rhetoric are themselves rhetorical! Our former editor, E. L. Hunt, expressed this thought very well in an editorial in this JOURNAL for April 1928, From Rhetoric Deliver Us.

But it is time to call a halt! For it is apparent that when we are writing of such matters as ends justifying means, we are no longer writing of the ethics of persuasion particularly but of ethics generally. We started in search for an answer to the question—Is there a line or boundary at which the legitimate appeals in speech-making stop and the illegitimate begin? We saw the difficulties in the way of a satisfactory norm, and then we saw how even two standard rules may at times be broken with propriety. When we examine the rules closely, what do they amount to? They are of no more help than if we did not have them as guides. For they are merely rules which any man of good character in life would normally observe anyway. In other words, persuasion ethics is general ethics!

This solution, as I have said before, is not a novel one. Winans, after presenting some hard questions which arise [quoted heretofore] follows them up by saying: "This, like other questions of platform ethics, does not differ essentially from the problems of our everyday intercourse." And later in his outstanding book, Public Speaking, he strikes the keynote of this paper: "What use a speaker may make of his power will depend upon the kind of a man he is. The man who is unscrupulous off the platform will be unscrupulous on the platform."

Credence is lent this common sense view of the matter when we reflect that the same ethical problems exist wherever contacts with human nature are required at first hand, such as in salesman-

whatever that may be. Protest is useless. When their confidence is gained, it may be possible to turn them in another direction, for a mob is very fickle." *Public Speaking*, p. 238.

ship and in advertising. Both these activities of our daily lives are, like public speaking, subject to abuse. Many years ago, my fancy was caught by the striking title on the outside cover of a pamphlet, "Is Life Worth Living?" Upon turning the page, the readers were greeted with the perhaps truthful but unexpected announcement, "It all depends on the liver!" It was a patent-medicine advertisement. Was that fraudulent advertising? In salesmanship, where does legitimate selling stop and "high-pressure salesmanship" begin? The point is not so much that the line between right and wrong is in these fields just as difficult to draw, but that these problems exist in these other realms just as they do in public speaking.

There are those who insist upon a higher standard for speech than they themselves exercise in everyday life. Tact for them becomes subterfuge, and applied psychology becomes trickery.[6] And yet our everyday life is full of departures from the rigid adherence to truth which some would insist upon for speech. These people should remember that if speech has in some instances its problems of ethics, they are no more than a reflection of the problems of everyday life.[7]

[6] Cf. the parallel in the dramatic field cited by the present President of the National Association, JOHN DOLMAN, JR. in his book, *The Art of Play Production*, p. 136—"There is another sort of opposition to the careful planning of stage movement and business; a sort that comes less frequently from actors and directors than from critics, authors, and professors of literature. IT IS BASED ON AN EXALTED WORSHIP OF SINCERITY [capitals mine], and takes the form of denunciation of all conscious technique as a kind of trickery. . . . It is trickery. But so is all art. The only perfect absence of trickery is to be found in pure accident, and pure accident is not art."

[7] An interesting article in *Pearson's Magazine* (Vol. 9:p. 575) refers in humorous vein to the havoc that would be wrought in society were a film to record the thoughts of social beings in society. "How could you consent to be presented to a happy household, and have the face to say the usual pleasant things when your host might discover afterwards, on developing the film, that in reality you thought all the children plain but not so ugly as their mother, and that you considered your host himself a bounder from the word jump? Nothing could go on. Commerce would be impossible; old established friendships would be broken up; families would be disintegrated.

One would never be able, with any feeling of confidence, to sell a horse to one's best friend, or to attend as sole legatee the funeral of a dis-

What would our purists who insist upon the absolute truth in speech think of the ethics of the pastor of a Pittsburgh congregation who applied psychology in the following instance? "The pastor requested the women to remove their hats so as not to obstruct the view of those in the rear. Only a few complied. But the pastor quickly added: 'My request does not apply to elderly ladies. I hope, however, that the young women will do me the favor.' In a moment every woman in the church had removed her hat."[8]

Carried to its logical conclusion, this attitude of insistence upon absolute truth leads to ludicrous results. The businessman must display his dresses on average, not on beautiful, women; the girl must not assist whatever Nature has done for her by supplementary visits to the drug store; the clergyman must not have for his sermons the aids of beautiful surroundings, soft lights, and entrancing music. These attackers of rhetoric to be consistent would probably insist that fishing is deception; they would advocate the college student making his approach as a summer salesman by boldly announcing: "Lady, I'm a book-agent! Do you want a book?"

In the speech field, they would probably decry the advice of the coach of oratory, "Put more feeling into it!" on the ground that such resultant feeling, so invoked, was premeditated, and certain not to be genuine. Factors of attention and impelling motives, because consciously studied and deliberately applied, would come under their ban. Such people, those who are overquick to condemn persuasive methods, are present in every community. Since, however, persuasion ethics is general ethics, we have a right to insist upon the same leeway for speech that is accorded to every other activity of our daily lives.

I have not sought to condone, much less to encourage, false persuasion. On the contrary, we as teachers should constantly discourage it where it is present and obviously in conflict with

tant and very wealthy relative, or to witness the performance of amateur theatricals in the cause of charity. All the amenities and pleasantness of life would vanish. Plain truth is excellent in theory; it is useful in the law courts; it is highly spoken of in poems; but plain truth in society would break society. In a civilised country one should no more be expected to expose one's convictions than to go naked."

[8] EDGAR F. SWIFT, Phychology and the Day's Work, p. 338.

general ethics. We should do our part in making the elder Cato's definition of an orator become increasingly more meaningful: "Vir bonus peritus dicendi -a good man skilled in speaking." But when we realize the tremendous power of speech for good or evil, I do feel that the wonder is, not that speech has been abused so much, but that it has been abused no more.

ENRICHED COURSE-CONTENT

EVELYN KONIGSBERG
Richmond Hill High School, New York

ONE of the first and most important problems facing the speech teacher who wishes to have his work receive from those outside the field the recognition he feels it deserves is, "*What* shall we teach?" A great deal of the unfavorable criticism and disparagement of speech teaching has been caused by the general belief on the part of those members of the administrative and teaching forces whose work has the approval of long standing and custom, that the speech teacher has no "facts" to offer, that his subject is a vague, undefined, evanescent, impractical thing which does not touch the real things of a student's life; that it cannot produce the tangible results of the so-called "book" subjects. And very often this attitude is unconsciously fostered by the teacher of speech who fails to make use of the factual material dealing with his subject.

In all speech education (in which term the writer includes oral English, elocution, oral interpretation, debate, dramatics, public speaking,—call it what you will), the most important result to be obtained is the doing of the ideal thing rather than knowing how it ought to be done. But can we call ourselves educators if we fail to make use of the great body of scientific information dealing with our subject, to make the student and the observer realize that there is a very real and meaty course-content, a knowledge of which must precede the speaking practice of the student? No good teacher of mathematics sets a student to solving an original problem before he understands the theorem underlying it. Can we say that a student in the speech class shall improve his voice use, correct his defective pronunciation, or give an artistic interpretation

of a poem without making sure that he understands the principles underlying these acts?

Granted that the knowing how and why we do a thing must come before the doing, it becomes the task of the teacher to be first of all a maker of the speech course of study. Herein lies the opportunity of the speech teacher to exercise a real influence on the life of the student, if he can make him aware of the importance of speech as it affects his everyday life,—in conversation at the family dinner table, in his effective recitation in all class-rooms, in his social contacts, and in the business world which he expects to enter. How can this best be done?

Speech teachers know that there is a great body of material dealing accurately and scientifically with the subject they teach, but in order to gain for speech education its deserved academic credit, this material ought to be down in black and white in the course of study, and so be accessible to all. Administrators and students alike are impressed by a bulk of material, by reference to authoritative writings, by the use of charts and mechanical devices for demonstration. The question presents itself, "Are these things for impressive purposes only? Is it not true that the results of laboratory investigation in the field of speech have a real and basic place in secondary school speech education? Can we dare to neglect to incorporate into the course of study all the tools and facts offered us by the investigator that may serve as short-cuts to our chief objective?"

Perhaps the most important point a teacher ought to get into his course of study for speech classes is that speech is a result of a mental and emotional urge to communicate an idea or feeling, and that for this reason, the fundamental thing to be dealt with in the speech class is that mental and emotional state of the speaker. On this realization hinges all our technical work, and much of our technical material and method can be and ought to be subordinated to this basic fact. A good course of study ought to include the teaching of the effect of the physical environment, climate and geographical conditions, on voice and speech. It should provide for the teaching of facts as to the part played by the physical condition of the speaker, his mental and emotional states, and the force of his desire to communicate his thought to another.

Only after these facts have been taken into account can we

deal logically with the technical aids to better voice and speech. That poor voice use interferes with a person's power to transfer ideas can readily be shown, and the course of study should include facts as to the technic of the use of the voice mechanism to avoid or cure such interference. It is the duty of the speech teacher to cull out and incorporate into the teaching content known scientific facts about voice production and training in the effective use of the mechanism from both physiological and acoustical standpoints. Teaching of voice use, to command the respect of the student, must be removed from the realm of the vague and the "arty" and placed on a sound scientific basis. Accurate terminology should be insisted on so that the student may know he is dealing with a definite subject. There has been much investigation of the voice and its use, and the speech teacher should make himself and his students familiar with scientific facts and methods and dignify the work by reference to printed material, charts, and the use of such apparatus as may be available and helpful.

But voice must be shaped into speech sounds, and the knowledge of what those sounds are, how they are produced, and their relation to each other in English words is also an important factor in forming better speech habits in the student. The satisfactory course of study should not neglect the study of phonetics and the use of phonetic script as a *tool* in the understanding of English sounds and the correction of defective pronunciations. Provision should be made for reference to and the use of various dictionaries and standard works on the psychology of speech, speech improvement, and history of the language. No course of study which is to have any real claim for academic recognition can fail to point the way for both student and teacher to make free use of the many fine text and reference books whenever needful.

But if the great stress in speech education is to be placed not on the technical side but on the use of acceptable expressive speech by the student, the course of study should offer an abundance of suggestive material for the informal talk or conversation lesson in class. Suggestions for the use of topics related to the daily life of the student and to the work of the group should be given. The place of speech in everyday living, radio talks and programs on the subject, the effect of the talking motion picture, the telephone conversation, and the attention that voice and speech are receiving in

the current press are all suitable topics worthy of a place in class consideration. If the class teacher prefers the use of subjects not directly connected with the speech work, the course of study should provide for the use of topics of real literary, historical, or scientific merit.

A course of study that includes the teaching of the interpretation of the printed page should aim for the recognition of the fact that the purpose of any interpretation is to leave a definite impression on the audience. The emotional urge that prompts an author to write as he does, the speaker's part in conveying this to an audience, and the feeling that he desires to rouse in an audience as a result of his work ought to be considered as a part of that impression. How it can be made or marred by the skill with which tone quality, inflection, rate of speed, pause, timing, rhythm and gesture are used by the speaker should be part of the content of the course. It should include a discussion of these points in such a way that the teacher and student are aware of them as definite tools to be used consciously and with discrimination in the interpretation of selections of fine prose, poetry, or dramatic material. Standards for the choice of such material should also be taught, and material offered should always be of high literary quality suited to the nature of the occasion on which it is to be used. Lists of books, poems, and plays of the type desired might well be given so that the inexperienced teacher and the student may have a guide to sources of material.

An opinion as to exactly how much of this content belongs in any given course of study must be governed by a knowledge of the type of student, the ability and training of the teacher, and the time allowed for accomplishment. The fact remains, however, that there is a wealth of scientific material dealing with all phases of speech work, and that speech education will not take its proper place in the academic world until this knowledge is incorporated into the course of study. A definite well-founded course,content can aid not only in commanding respect from administrators and those outside the field, but also in giving the inexperienced teacher some guides to go by, and in impressing the student with the value and scope of his speech work. Rather let us have at hand more subject-matter than we can use than be left to search vaguely and fruitlessly in the class period for something real to give the stu-

dent. For speech education is a real subject; it has business, social, and cultural values; and the speech course of study should make these facts apparent to all.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PLAY PRODUCER

EVA VAN NATTA
East High School, St. Louis, Missouri

IN the past, and I am afraid sometimes even in the present, the chief qualifications of a high school play producer were all too frequently that he or she be capable of teaching English, and in the case of a woman, that she weigh about one-hundred and fifty pounds. Probably the best reason to be assigned for the first requisite is that the English teacher, having many themes to read, and contests of various kinds to conduct, is so used to work that a little more won't matter, or at least that she is too tired to object strenuously. The second requirement is just as important, for it takes a very imposing woman to dominate a group of high school boys and girls in such an informal activity as a play rehearsal. Besides, she may want to build or shift some scenery!

Some of us would probably be surprised to find how widespread these ideas are even now. But thanks to the increasing number of play-production classes in the colleges and universities, and to the rapid development of community theatres, the ideals and standards are changing, and the principals and superintendents have a little better standardized idea as to what sort of person they should put in charge of high school play production. But those who know in detail the qualifications of such a person, and who can intelligently supervise and guide the young teacher in the work are still all too few. Probably no high school principal will ever read this paper, but I shall nevertheless set forth in it some things which I think he, as well as those of us who produce high school plays, should know.

Taking for granted that the producer of high school plays has the moral qualifications which should belong to every leader of adolescent youth, it seems that her next qualification should be a

knowledge of what she is trying to do. What should be the aims of high school play production? First of all, such an activity should give to as many students as possible a definite and worthwhile outlet for the inborn dramatic instinct. Second, play production perhaps more than any other single phase of the high school curriculum, should train for adjustment to a complex society. Third, the producer of plays should make the school play felt as an integral part of the school—not just an adventitious sprout for making money; and last but not least, the work in high school play production should help to create "better audiences for better plays."*

Now that she knows where she is going the next object of the play producer is to know how to get there. She must know the technique of her work. Just because a teacher knows the field of literature, it does not necessarily follow that she can produce plays. And I shall digress here to say further, that if a system cannot afford to have a full-time specialist in speech, it would be preferable to combine the work of play-production with almost any other department than English, for probably the English teacher is already the most overworked member of the staff. Of course, I am not unaware of the fact that the English teacher's tastes and inclinations are apt to include an interest in plays, which accounts for the fact that this work is more often pushed into her department than any other. But when it does fall there, the teaching load should be made lighter to allow for the hours of rehearsal which require a freshness that she can hardly have after the grading of multitudinous English themes. Certainly, the English teacher should not be expected to know the *technique* of play production any more than should the teacher of physics. Knowing the literary value of plays is a far different thing from knowing how to produce them.

This brings me back to my point of digression. The producer of high school plays needs a special training in the technique of her art. The fact that she has taken part in high school or college plays does not necessarily mean that she has acquired this technique. Such training, though of some advantage is by no means enough. Above all things the broken-down professional actor, or the woman who has been an actress and given up her career to marry one of

* L. W. CRANDALL: Drama in the Schools, Little Theatre Monthly, V. 2, p. 99.

the leading business men of the town, will rarely if ever make a suitable producer of high school plays, because the purely professional person will rarely fit into the educational scheme. The well-qualified high school producer of plays should have a thorough training in Stage-Craft and Play-Production in a college or university.

The teacher trained in a well organized Play Production Department knows that there is a technique of placing the voice so the audience will hear, while carrying on a conversation with another actor; that there is a difference between physical and dramatic balance; that characterization and atmosphere are the keynotes of a successful play. She is keenly aware that while gaining these effects she is teaching boys and girls. She knows also the value of organization in her work. She realizes that she cannot do everything herself, do it well, and still remain alive and in her right mind when the performance is over. She appreciates the fact that she is only the director and that she would be doing not only herself an injustice, but also her students if she failed to apportion the work among them.

We will suppose that this well-trained individual is put on the staff in a high school and given a class in Drama,—which, of course, is the ideal situation. Not everyone in the class, presumably, will be in the casts of the plays produced, but there is work for everyone to do. A play is a composite thing. So much so in fact, that in the lives of some youngsters it could very easily take a vocational turn. For example I have known boys who have confessed no knowledge of electricity or of scene-building, but signified a willingness to work on such a committee with others who did know something about the field, to develop such a strong interest in that particular phase of the work that in future productions, they begged to be put on the same committee. Who knows but that these boys may have found a tiny beginning for their life-work right here?

Student committees with faculty advisers should be in charge of every department of the work. All committees should be organized with a view both to efficiency and to giving the boy and girl a chance to develop. Neither of these ends is complete without the other. The well-trained teacher will know that there must be at least one or two on each committee who know something about the work, or who are particularly interested in finding out about it.

The chairman should be of this type. This is for the good of the play. Next she should know that certain other students need rounding out along certain lines. For example, Dorothy is a bit timid though altogether dependable. It will be good training for her to go to a chicken-hatchery and negotiate for the use of a dozen baby chicks needed to add realism to the door-yard scene, or to a local theatre to try to borrow some grass mats. Or in a small community, to Farmer Brown for the chickens and to the Odd Fellow's Hall or the Methodist Church for a green carpet. Another girl whose standards of taste in dress are not the best, might be put on the costume committee with a sufficient number who are really fitted for the work to maintain balance, and here obtain practical knowledge that will forever help her in making her social adjustments. If she is of no other use to the committee, she can see that the costumes are carefully hung in the dressing-rooms or lockers whenever not in use.

A student stage-manager should be selected whose business it is to be the director's right-hand man. This student should be chosen because he has qualities which promise to develop into real executive ability. His work should be given publicity in every possible way, and he should be made to feel much of the responsibility for the success of the play. The wise director will consult with him on many of the problems which arise in the production of the play and should make him feel his co-partnership as much as possible. During rehearsals he should hold the prompt-book and prompt for action which has been "blocked," as well as for lines, leaving the director free to work for characterization and effects. The student is then well qualified to prompt during the performance. In case of extreme emergency he should be able to carry on a rehearsal without the director. This, however, is seldom advisable with high school students unless some teacher is present. But if it should happen a week before the play is produced that the well-qualified producer should acquire scarlet fever, the stage-manager and committee chairman should know the work so well that another teacher could step in and pick up the threads with their help so that the play could go on as scheduled.

The stage-manager will have an assistant who acts as call-boy during the performance. The property manager with his committee, sees to collecting all properties, and during the performance

attends the property cues. The scenery committee prepares the scenery and does the scene-shifting during the dress-rehearsal and performance. The costume and make-up committee sees that proper costumes are procured, supervises their proper adjustment, and after much practice in rehearsal "makes up" the cast for the performance. The lighting committee has everything ready to procure the proper lighting effects, and the chairman manipulates the switchboard during the dress rehearsal and performance. The business and publicity committees take care of selling and seating the house, paying the bills, and keeping the local and school press and school community informed of the high spots in the play and the reasons why everyone should see it.

This ability to organize successfully presupposes a knowledge and understanding of the high school age. Perhaps the best qualified producer will sometimes make mistakes in the personnel of her staff of student helpers. But if she knows a great deal about boys and girls she can build up an organization which will produce not only a successful play, but also young men and women much better qualified to adjust themselves to many situations they will meet in life. And I repeat that there is nothing else in connection with the high school curriculum which trains so well in the matter of social adjustments as does the high school play. To achieve this result the producer must have the personal quality of sincerity without which no man or woman should be permitted to attempt to put on a high school play. She must be absolutely honest with herself and the play group in assigning duties, from the lead in the cast down to the least important members of the committees. If the play group cannot feel confidence in their director's fairness there will be dissension and dissatisfaction, where there should be harmony and joy in the work of creation.

One very strong point in which the high school play producer should differ from the professional producer is that with the professional producer "the play's the thing," and with the producer of high school plays *the pupil is most emphatically the thing.* The play must be good of course. It should be very carefully chosen, with a view to giving the audience the greatest possible satisfaction under existing conditions. It should belong to the better drama class, but I do not think it advisable to make its reach exceed the grasp of the play group, or especially of the high school audience.

To illustrate, I knew of a splendidly coached high school cast in "Outward Bound" which made as nearly a failure as would be possible with a play done by so excellent a director, because the play was too subtle for the very unappreciative audience to which it played. The well qualified director will keep in mind that she is not only training her play group to be members of "better audiences for better plays," but the audience itself, by seeing successive productions of good high school plays is to be trained to appreciate the higher type of drama.

To return to my statement that the pupil is the thing rather than the play, I will suggest the possibility of using a double cast. If the play is one which requires few characters I think the producer who is working toward her aim of giving to as many students as possible an outlet for their inborn dramatic instinct, will sometimes at least use two casts for the same play given on two different nights. If the cast is small and the class is talented this is an excellent way to give more students a chance to develop their talents. It is not quite as good a way as to use one act plays, but I think it advisable to give the school's public a long play at least every other time. The double cast increases the amount of work in rehearsal, but does not double it, for of course, both casts are present at all rehearsals, and each gains much from the other. This does not mean that they shall imitate each other's characterization (though that danger is present) but get the general group action. Each student should be guided in his study of his character so that he may give an intelligent characterization of his own. To develop a play cast into little automatons imitating their coach is an abomination. On the other hand I think it frequently gives a student self-confidence to have a speech interpreted for him, and he will sometimes take an interpretation which is given him and work it over into a better one of his own. Especially is this true when he is the type for his part. Belasco frequently does scenes for his actors, and if those who are stars are helped by this kind of suggestion I see no reason why high school people may not also be helped, provided, of course, they are not given too much of it. A piece of work which is primarily creative will not only have a far greater educational value to the student concerned, but will please the audience more, for if the students fit their parts they can do them better than the coach, after they really get an interpretaion of the character. I realize

that there is a great deal of controversy on that point which I can't very well settle here, but I believe in selecting people for parts (for a public performance) because I think they can do those particular parts. That much we as a school owe to our public, and I can see no harm coming to the student because he is given a task which he can do well. It follows then that a student will not be given a part in the cast when he is not fitted for it, merely because he has worked hard on committees in other productions, or because he is deserving for any other reason than fitness for the part. A place on a play cast like a place on a basketball team should be won through the merit of the particular individual for the particular part.

On the other hand, if two individuals show about equal merit for a certain part, and one has been more faithful in other duties and is more deserving of honor, he should be given the part. And if any individual once given a coveted post proves undependable, there should be no hesitation about replacing him with one who may not be quite so capable but is more trustworthy. In my opinion the teacher who understands high school boys and girls should not keep all of her reasons for doing as she does to herself. She will take her whole class into her confidence about many of her decisions, letting all know those things which it will be wholesome for them to know as to why the decisions were as they were. This may sometimes cause a particular boy or girl and even his immediate friends to pout for a while, but when he gets tired of that, he will usually come back with a much greater degree of loyalty than would have been the case if he had not had a complete explanation (and understood the justice of it) as to why he lost the part. There are many virtues which go to make up an ideal member of a play group, but the greatest of these is loyalty, and the high school play producer who can keep the largest percentage of loyalty among her group through the trying days of try-out and rehearsal has one of the chief qualifications attendant upon her position.

Now, of course, a producer of high school plays cannot be a law unto herself in any school. A principal, looking for a teacher of Dramatics wants someone who will cooperate. If he gets her from a college or university where she has been trained in the work from an educational point of view, he will probably have no trouble. She will understand how to adjust herself to the administra-

tion, to other departments and to the community; or at least she will learn to do it more easily than a coach taken from the professional field. A producer of high school plays should realize that she cannot upset the whole educational program for a month or so just because she is putting on a play. On the other hand, it is her job to educate the administration which needs such enlightenment to the importance of the play as an integral part of the school program. If her principal is not already alive to the educational advantages of the school play she can gently lead him to an appreciation of the fact that here is one of the most complete educational projects in the whole school system. In most instances it will probably be a long process to get him to realize that the play has a right to its own receipts, if it needs them, and that he has no right to expect the play to fill the ever empty coffers of the athletic department. This is probably a step in civilization which will require the persistent efforts of organized dramatic teachers to achieve; but at least each individual teacher must educate her own particular administration to a belief in the royalty play and to the necessity of sufficient equipment to produce the play with some degree of credit to the school.

The well-qualified producer of high school plays will know how to cooperate with and procure the cooperation of the other departments. The department of Home Economics may be planning a little health-play or fashion-show to advertise the department. They are very likely to approach the dramatic coach for help. Such help, cheerfully given will do much toward procuring the cooperation of that department when help with costumes for a play, or tarts for the nave of Hearts to steal, are needed. It is surprising how many of the departments, through their departmental clubs want some "expert" advice from the drama teacher. This she should always give if possible, first because every department should cooperate with every other department of the school, and selfishly, because in the stress of producing a play the director needs the cooperation of other departments. She needs the Physics teacher as adviser for the lighting committee, the clothing teacher, or someone equally qualified as adviser for the costume committee, and so on through the committees, giving each, of course, her own well worked out ideas of the effects desired. Huntly Carter says of Max

Reinhardt, "It comes to this, then, that the new director is an individual multiplied by many individuals all working in harmony."* This, it seems to me, is infinitely more true of the high school than the professional producer. Since I have introduced Huntly Carter's article on "The Theatre of Max Reinhardt" I shall digress to quote one more statement. "When creation becomes the whole object of the theatre, discipline will cease to exist." Again I make my application to the high school play, and I wonder if creation, rather than the hundred and fifty pounds is not the secret of discipline here.

Another point where coöperation is needed is with the community. Perhaps the chief need for their cooperation is in attendance at the play. This can best be secured by consistently giving them their money's worth when they attend a school play. But other means of cooperation are necessary, also. A neighborhood church may be producing a Christmas play under a volunteer director with little training. Some of the members of the cast are in the drama teacher's classes. They ask for help on individual parts, and suggestions as to costuming and staging. This should be very thoughtfully given, and sometimes if it is possible, on request of the person in charge, the teacher's presence at one of the rehearsals will be very much appreciated. Neighborhood groups such as churches, lodges, clubs, etc. often make requests for numbers on their programs, such as readings, and even one-act plays which have previously been given at school. The wise teacher will always comply with these requests if possible, both because she should cooperate with her community and because she may thus give valuable training to her students.

The best of care should be taken of properties borrowed in the community. The director should always check with the chairman of the committee to see that borrowed properties are returned no later than the next school day after the last performance of the play. This will do much toward securing the cooperation of the community when properties are needed for the next play, and incidentally it may have a tendency to impress upon members of the property committee the importance of caring for borrowed property.

* HUNTLY CARTER, The Theatre of Max Reinhardt, Liv. Age, Vol. 322, p. 43.

Another qualification which is almost always required of a high school play producer is ability to make much of little. F. E. Washburn-Freund says of Max Reinhardt that he can do a play with almost nothing and carry his audience with him. "Only the master can do this; the imitator would fail miserably."* It is evident that he knows nothing about a high school play. However, his standard of success or failure is very different from ours, as it is perfection in art rather than educational achievement. But even we will grant that it takes much more skill to put on a play successfully in a makeshift auditorium, than on a splendidly equipped stage. This paper has presupposed a Drama class in which the director gets a good start on many of her problems. But more often than not the high school play producer does not have such a class. In which case the play is probably given by the Seniors, or Juniors, or a Dramatic Club or some similar organization. Then the producer must make much of little time, and of pupils of little training. She must also be able to inspire her committees to work with little credit, for, of course, they do not have a mark as an incentive when they are not getting class credit. In the matter of scenery the efficient producer will make much of little, for some of the most effective scenery is very inexpensive. Neutral curtains make excellent backgrounds for many plays. Many costumes can be made for the rental cost and then be kept in the school wardrobe for future use. But it would require another paper as long as this to go into detail about making a little go a long way in the matter of equipment.

I have tried to cover a large field, too large, I fear, to have done it well. I have tried to show that a producer of high school plays should know where she is going, and the technique for arrival; that she should be a good organizer, and that she should have ability to cooperate with and secure cooperation from those with whom she works; and above all that she should be imbued with the educational point of view. All this, that the high school boy and girl may become better, wiser, and happier members of society as a result of contact with the high school play.

* In "Max Reinhardt's Evolution," International Studio, vol. 78, p. 346.

EDITORIAL

COÖPERATION WITH THE ENGLISH COUNCIL

Last April the English Council extended to the Executive Council of our Association an invitation to join them in a study of curriculum, course-content, and teaching techniques. Our Council met in Evanston, Illinois on May 3rd for an extended and sympathetic consideration of this proposal and authorized our President to appoint a representative committee to survey the situation and coöperate with the English Council in every possible way to the end that we may find out where our common task lies and what we can do about it.

It seems perfectly obvious to most of us that the English teacher and the Speech teacher do have a common task and that neither English nor Speech can be handled adequately in isolation from the other. The English teacher cannot teach English and ignore Speech; no more can the Speech teacher teach Speech and ignore English. There is a common foundation which should be laid properly before separation between the two disciplines is desirable.

However, there are among us those who are fearful of any move in the direction of common action lest the old story of the lion lying down with the lamb shall be repeated, the lion all outside the lamb of course! Some teachers of English still hold to the anachronistic notion that the Speech needs of high school students can be satisfied adequately by having the English teacher—who may or may not be competent to teach Speech—pay a few minutes of more or less casual attention to "Oral English" or "Oral Composition" once a week for a term or two. These teachers doubtless think that the old axiom, "The greater includes the lesser," can be applied to course-content in English and Speech on the assumption, to be sure, that English is the greater and Speech the lesser. Certainly this point of view does not characterize the present leaders of the English Council who are quite as anxious as we are to ascer-

tain the real Speech training needs of pupils and see that they are served.

We should add that there are those in our own ranks who seem excessively perturbed by the suggestion that high school work in English and Speech may conceivably be carried on quite satisfactorily without a complete administrative separation of the two disciplines. Such people are sometimes so much concerned about labels that they forget to insist upon having the proper goods in the package. Is it not much more important to have pupils properly trained than to have special departmental boundary lines rigorously protected against invasion? English teachers and Speech teachers are beginning to free themselves from their fears and prejudices and face their common task. If the desire to serve the student and fit him for the actual business of living can come to dominate our minds and control our procedures to the exclusion of petty and unworthy professional jealousies, we shall indeed move forward through the work of these joint committees.

OUR WHOLE CASE IN A NUTSHELL

A short time ago, at a conference on speech training in the secondary schools, a high school principal, upon being asked whether or not he believed in speech work, epitomized our whole case pretty well when he said: "As I see the situation, the issues are:

First, Has speech training a particularly valuable contribution to make to the life of the high school pupil?

Second, Can speech actually be *taught?*

Third, Is it necessary for the teacher of speech to have had special professional training?

To all of these question I answer emphatically in the affirmative."

There we have it! Can any one successfully make out a negative on any of these issues? If not, how much longer can the American school administrator justify the exclusion of adequate speech training from the program of so many high schools throughout the country?

AN OLD SHIBBOLETH QUESTIONED

One of the pet and rather fixed ideas of speech teachers has always been that speech training can be carried on efficiently only

with individual pupils or with very small classes. Our adherence to this supposedly sacrosanct doctrine has made us demand very special conditions for our work. Have we been justified in this? Does anyone *know* that speech training can be done well only in the private studio or in classes with enrollments under fifteen? Does it not come with something of a shock to us to learn that extensive investigations by research workers in Education have revealed no negative correlation between the size of the classes and the quality of teaching and learning? Have we not overlooked the fact that, under well organized class-room procedures, those who are looking and listening may be learning and that no one in such a class-room can possibly be wholly passive or uninfluenced by what is going on? Perhaps we have been taking something for granted and using it as a guiding principle without the support of any objective evidence. What is the answer?

THE DESIDERATA

The sixth year-book of the Educational Press Association of America lays down certain criteria to be applied to manuscripts considered for publication and suggests that only those which meet the following tests should be accepted:

1. Do they further the policies for which the Journal stands?
2. Are they presented in satisfactory English?
3. Do they claim a larger amount of space than the topics merit?
4. Will they appeal to a large percentage of the subscribers?
5. Do they cover ground too recently covered?
6. Are the factual data accurate?

These tests seem to us excellently conceived and thoroughly applicable to the special conditions of our publication. So far as it is possible to guide our editorial practice by principles, these are the principles which we shall invoke in making decisions as to which manuscripts to accept and which to reject.

THE FORUM

IS THIS TRAGIC OR COMIC?

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

Thinking that some of your readers might wish to become enlightened on the subject of "jesters," I enclose the following quotation. It is taken word for word from a student's answer to the question, "Describe the nature and purpose of *gestures.*"

"Jesters. This is something that comes to most people more or less by natural ability. Others have to strive for it, and this makes their jesters noticeable, and they are unable to put them across in a correct manner. In making a good jester, be talking along in your modern way, crack your jester and go on. Don't stand and wait for your audience to laugh, and when they begin to laugh, you do likewise. That makes a very poor jester. Be natural in your wit, make them think you are fortunate in having a display of natural ability.

Many times a speaker can display his wit by a natural display on words. This is one of the easiest and best ways for a person to show his ability in making jesters.

Some things a person should keep in mind in regard to this question are: be natural, don't make your jesters in an open fashion. If the audience doesn't catch it, don't repeat, but slide along to the next one. Don't have too many jesters as it will tend to make the talk sound foolish. Keep these things in mind, and you will get along o. k. with the jester part in a debate."

Now, in the words of our Japanese boy friend, "hoping you are the same," I am,

Puzzled

H. A. WHITE,
University of Nebraska

BUSINESS SPEAKING—A REPLY TO MR. BRIGANCE

To the Editor of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH:

The very interesting Forum letter (Quarterly, April, 1930) by Mr. Brigance, which commented on my article, "Teaching Business Speaking—A Modern Trend," (QUARTERLY, November, 1929) raises a few points which need to be clarified.

In the first place, he seems to assume that the classification of business speech types which I advocated was intended to supplant all other classifications, including his own. Nothing could have been further from my thoughts. How Mr. Brigance could have secured that impression I do not know. I readily grant, and I thought that my article was clear on that point, that his and other classifications have been and are very useful in the teaching of Public Speaking. My whole criticism of both his classification and that by Mr. Baker is that they are not designed to train our students to make the kind of talks they will be called upon to make in ordinary business life. Their classifications train students for the exceptional speech situation. While I grant, as noted above, that there is a place in our speech programs for a course on his forms of public address, yet I believe that we can be of far greater service to our students by providing, also, a course similar to the one suggested in my article. My article attempted to show the need for a classification which would be useful to students of business speaking.

My position is that we can serve our students better by teaching them how to compose and deliver the speech types which they will meet in their ordinary, everyday life. I contend that my classification will prove useful to a far greater number of students than his. I believe that an examination of both classifications will make this apparent. If I understand Mr. Brigance's position, he believes that his list of speech types will be useful to a greater number of students than mine. If so, we shall have to let others in our field express themselves.

For those students who are interested in the speech types in his classification or who wish considerable advanced training, let courses in those types be provided. I have such a course at The George Washington University. It is called, "Public Speaking 107, Persuasion and the Forms of Public Address." Students of this course are taught exactly the types so eloquently advocated

by Mr. Brigance. In fact, I used Mr. Brigance's, "Classified Speech Models," in this course this year. My experience with this course both here and elsewhere indicates that it is useful to the few and not to the many.

In the second place, Mr. Brigance objects to my contention that his classification fails to give adequate recognition to business speaking. He says that this type of speaking was included in his classification under the title, *General Campaign Speeches.* I believe that it would be helpful to quote the entire section devoted to *General Campaign Speeches,* in Brigance's, "The Spoken Word."[1]

"2. General Campaign Speeches. Campaign speeches are not to be narrowed to political parties and political elections. Henry Ward Beecher's great series of addresses in England during the Civil War were certainly campaign speeches, yet they had no direct bearing upon any approaching British elections. A temperance speaker addresses college students upon the physical evils of alcohol; his end is not related to politics, yet it is a campaign speech. The World Peace Foundation sends out its speakers to address various public gatherings upon the necessity and means of promoting world peace. They are campaign speeches, but not political campaign speeches. A railway president addresses a luncheon club endeavoring to promote coöperation between his railway and their community. Decidedly it is a campaign speech, but one having nothing to do with politics. These speeches we call *general campaign speeches.*

"Such speeches have a more distant and ultimate goal than any we have so far discussed. The lawyer in the court room asks for an immediate verdict. The legislator wants his bill to pass. The political campaigner wants our vote on election day. But the general campaigner, if we may so call him, aims at a less obvious end. He does not desire us merely to vote yes or no, or to put our mark opposite his name on the ballot. He aims at influencing our actions, our habits, our mental attitudes. He says 'Realize how imperative is world peace and throw your influence as a citizen behind this plan for promoting it.' Or 'You citizens of this community, coöperate with your railroad that we may better serve you.' All of this, you see, is less tangible than what

[1] Pp. 281-2.

the lawyer, legislator or politician asks. Therefore it calls for a different mode of procedure. The general campaigner aims little by little, this year, next year, at changing the attitude of his public and getting the result ultimately desired. These other speakers need a whole immediate result, and if they do not get it they have failed, but the general campaigner if he advances his case only a little way is reckoned successful."

I should like to ask Mr. Brigance, "Just how and where do you recognize business speaking in its entirety in this discussion of *general campaign speeches?*" Only two types of business speeches are discussed even remotely: goodwill and promotional speeches. I should like to ask him, "Just where have you provided for purely *informative* speeches, as distinguished from *motivative,* such as oral reports, instructions and explanations?" "Where have you provided for sales talk, discussions of policy, and inspirational talks?" Mr. Brigance's own description of *general campaign speeches* cannot be interpreted to include oral reports, instructions and explanations. It also entirely omits the most important of the motivative business speeches types, as sales, inspirational, and discussion of policy talks. Even if it was his intent to include them, he clearly has not done so.

As I have noted above, Mr. Brigance's discussion of *general campaign speeches* barely touches upon two types of business speeches and even these are not mentioned by name. These are goodwill and promotional talks. All of the others find no place in his book. In his Forum letter, Mr. Brigance attempts to show that business speeches are included in his classification and comments as follows, about my failure to note it: "Since, however, business speaking was not emphasized and since no models were included in *Classified Speech Models,* this is a matter which could most easily have escaped his attention." This is a most interesting statement. It is true that business speaking was not emphasized but, as a matter of fact, Brigance did include one business speech in *Classified Speech Models.* This is a promotional speech by Bruce Barton called "Which Knew Not Joseph." Since Mr. Brigance does not recognize it as such, it is just possible that he may have been deceived by its Biblical title into thinking that it involved "the rights and aspirations of man" rather than "his meat and raiment."

Mr. Brigance also raises the point that his "classification is based upon a study of speech *occasions* and upon a special examination of the features involved therein." He goes on to say, "business speeches are not, like court-room and after-dinner speeches, creatures of any one special type of occasion." Why not? He gives no explanation. He submits no proof—just his *ipse dixit*. Had he examined the reports of business speeches in any large number, he would have hesitated before making so untenable an assertion. As a matter of fact, business speeches are the products of widely varying business occasions and are of many special types. Moreover—in contradistinction to the special types of legal, religious, and political speeches to which he compares them in attempting to defend his failure to list them—they are types which everyone, no matter what his occupation, is called upon to make, and *does* make—well or ill as the case may be. Why not pay them, then, more than the "cold respect of a passing glance?" Everyone *does* make them whether he speaks in public or not.

To further answer Mr. Brigance's contention that business speeches are not the creatures of any one special type of occasion, let me cite the following kinds of business occasions: Group conferences, personal conferences and personal interviews, sales situations, meetings of boards of directors and of stockholders, and conventions.

Finally, Mr. Brigance, with all of that vehemenace, fantasy, and imagination, but withal good humor, which he has shown he is capable of bringing into his discussion, charges me with advocating atomism in speech education, in place of whatever it is that he stands for. I say this for the reason that his exact position on atomism is not clear. In one place he seems to take the position that the proper sort of instruction in Public Speaking should take the "whole view." And following this he appears to admit that some atomistic teaching is desirable and says, "The point between them is not whether there shall be specialization, but when this specialization shall begin." If in advocating specialization in the field of business speaking, I am atomistic, I must plead guilty to the charge.

As I understand our different points of view, it is how much general or liberal speech education should be given and to what extent should we permit specialization or atomism? In reference

to my position on this matter, Mr. Brigance says, "he is saying, in effect, 'Let us dispense with this general or liberal speech education; let us jump at once (or very quickly) into its specialized forms'." I said absolutely nothing about doing away with general speech education. In fact, I specifically pointed out that in my own teaching, this form of specialization comes after a course called "Principles of Effective Speaking." This is a three-hour, one-semester course and aims to give the student the comprehensive view of the field which both Mr. Brigance and I regard as essential. After this first course, I permit my students to specialize in those phases of Public Speaking in which they are interested. For those who wish additional cultural training, I have provided courses like "Masters of Public Address," a six credit-hour course running three hours a week throughout the year.

Mr. Brigance believes that I would "lessen the emphasis upon the basic, liberal, educational aspect of speech which springs from a comprehensive view of the whole field." I recognize that there are advantages to be gained from the study of a general course, but believe that a three-hour, one-semester course is sufficient. *I believe that specialized courses, such as the one I have proposed, are just as basic, just as liberal, and what is more import ant, more educational than the prolonged and necessarily repetitious general course.*

He rightly feels that the development of competent critics should be one of our aims. I believe that a specialized course in business speaking will make our students at least as competent critics of speeches made by others as will a general course. I believe that he will agree with me, however, that the chief aim of coures in Public Speaking is to train our students to communicate their ideas to others effectively. I believe that this aim can be attained better by providing a course similar to the one I have suggested. I assume that Mr. Brigance believes that this aim can be attained better by providing additional general training.

Like Mr. Brigance, I should welcome a discussion of this point of view by other members of our profession.

Cordially yours,

W. Hayes Yeager,
The George Washington University

OLD BOOKS

Preaching Without Notes. By Richard Storrs. New York: Dodd and Mead, 1875; pp. 233.

Anyone familiar with Winans' *Public Speaking* will remember seeing an occasional reference to this book. This book is undoubtedly the best attempt by an American at describing the extempore method of address. Storrs belonged to that galaxy of American preachers which flourished in the seventh and eighth decades of the last century. Other illustrious preachers of that period were Beecher and Brooks.

This book is made up of three lectures given at Union Theological Seminary. It is interesting that lectures recently given before the Boston University School of Theology and entitled *Effective Preaching* do not have a word to say about sermon-composition or sermon delivery. Maybe the neglect of the profession to say anything about these fundamental matters is symptomatic of the decline of preaching in the pulpit of America today. A man of Storrs's stature was not afraid to discuss such a purely technical question as Preaching Without Notes. This book has undoubtedly delivered more than one preacher from the lure of the manuscript. The copy I have at hand is a borrowed one from the Louisville Baptist Seminary. It is sadly worn. I notice that on the date slip in the back of the book that it was consulted several times in 1927, fifty years after its publication. Is the subject of the technique of delivery so unimportant that modern masters of pulpit utterance pass it up as unworthy? Why doesn't Fosdick or Cadman put out a volume that would help young preachers?

Some of the principles laid down by Storrs are:

1. Never begin to preach without notes with any idea of saving yourselves work by it.
2. Always be careful to keep up the habit of writing, with whatever skill, elegance, and force, you can command.
3. Be perfectly frank with your people in regard to this matter of your method of preaching.

4. Discharge your mind of the sermon when once you have preached it.

5. Keep your physical vigor at its highest attainable point.

6. Be very sure to keep your mind in a state of habitual activity, alertness, energy.

7. Be careful that the plan of your sermon is simple, natural, progressive, easily mastered, and is thoroughly imbedded in your mind.

8. One should have a distinct and an energetic sense of the importance of that particular subject on which he is to preach at the time.

9. To speak freely and usefully without notes, one should have, from the very beginning of his discourse, distinctly in view, a definite end, or practical impression, which his discourse is to make and leave on the minds before him.

10. Have in view individual hearers in the congregation.

11. Always carry with you into the pulpit a sense of the immense consequences which may depend on your full and faithful presentation of the truth.

12. Remember always to carry with you into the pulpit a sense of the personal presence of the Master.

Each of these thirteen precepts is elaborated and illustrated by Storrs; they form merely an outline of this unique and very helpful book.

LIONEL CROCKER, *Denison University*

The Origin and Progress of Writing. BY THOMAS ASTLE, Keeper of the Records of the Tower of London London: 1784.

i. "The noblest acquisition of mankind is SPEECH. . . .eminently distinguishes MAN from the brute creation. . . ."

1. "Speech may be considered as the substance; and writing, as the shadow which followed it."

"Two things are essential to speech; namely, *mental conceptions,* and *sounds articulate.*"

"The former are, by far, the most excellent, because they originate in, and appertain to, the mind; whereas the latter are nothing more than the operations of certain organs of the *body.*"

3. "It is evident that children learn to speak by *imitation,* they acquire articulate sounds before they comprehend the ideas of which those sounds are significant."

18. (Referring to the organs of Speech) "It is evident, that, from the confined nature of the organs, the simple natural sounds

to be distinct must be few. . . .they must be deficient in precision as they increase in number."

"The articulate sounds of vocal or audible language, are resolvable into sentences, words, and syllables; and the analysis of language into *elementary sounds,* seems to have led to the invention of *symbols,* or marks, for mental conceptions. This invention must have taken place, much about the time that men began to reform the barbarous jargon they first spoke, and form a language; for which purpose, the knowledge of elemental sounds and their powers, was absolutely necessary. The progress in this science. . . . must have been by degrees: men would begin, no doubt, by distinguishing the *sound* of one word from that of another,—this would not be difficult; then they would resolve words into syllables, which would not be so easy: but it is likely that they stopt there for a long time, perhaps for ages, before they came to the last resolution of syllables into the distinct sounds of which they are composed. This was a very extraordinary work of art, which could only be performed by those who had considered the laws of sounds; and could not be the result of chance. . . .for this was, in fact, the decomposition of a language into the sounds of which it is composed."

23. ". . . .*vowels* and *consonants;* the former of which, is defined to be a *simple articulate sound, uttered by a single impulse of the voice, and forming an articulate sound by itself;* whereas a consonant, forms no articulate sound of itself, but only assists in forming a sound."

229. "Human voice is produced by two semicircular membranes in the middle of the larynx, which form by their separation, the aperture that is termed the glottis. The space between these membranes is not one-tenth of an inch, through which the breath, transmitted from the lungs, passes with considerable velocity: in its passage it is said to give a brisk vibratory motion to the membranous lips of the glottis, which produces the sounds called voice, by an operation similar to that which produces sound from the two lips of a hautboy. (Does this settle the West-Metzger controversy?) It seems. . . .necessary for the production of voice, that a degree of tenseness should be communicated to the larynx, or at least to the two membranes above mentioned. The voice thus formed is strengthened and mellowed by a reverberation from the

palate, and other hollow places of the inside of the mouth and nostrils. . . .and thus the vocal organs of man appear to be, as it were, a species of flute or hautboy, whereof the membranous lips of the glottis are the mouth or reed, and the inside of the throat, palate, and nostrils, the body; the wind pipe being nothing more than the tube or canal which conveys the wind from the lungs to the aperture of this musical instrument."

NEW BOOKS

Effective Speech. (A textbook for beginning courses in speech.) By Harry B. Gough, Lousene Rosseau, Mary E. Cramer, and J. Walter Reeves. New York: Harper & Bros., 1930; pp. 572; $1.60.

Four things are likely to impress one on the first casual examination of this book: the unusual group of collaborating authors, four in number, each a specialist in his field, and representing respectively a liberal arts college, a teachers training school, a high school, and a privately endowed secondary school; the size and scope of the book; the low price for a book so large and so admirably made up; the name of Harper & Brothers as its publishers. Truly these of themselves constitute a strong recommendation of the book without further examination. A more careful survey will tend to strengthen this first impression.

The book has obviously been written primarily for use in secondary schools though it will doubtless find its way into many colleges for use in fundamental courses. It will serve as a text for a complete survey course covering a full year's work.

In the preface the authors claim that the view point is strictly modern as is its psychological approach. It considers speech as "a means of securing a better social adjustment of the individual and of increasing his efficiency."

In so far as could be done the authors have tried to avoid the use of a technical terminology and to express themselves in clear, simple, colloquial language.

The subject-matter is broadly subdivided into three main divisions. Part One, consisting of four chapters and occupying the first 155 pages, is devoted to FUNDAMENTALS OF SPEECH. The chapter headings are, (1) Introduction; (2) Bodily Expression; (3) Voice; (4) Diction or Word Language. Part Two, INTERPRETATIVE SPEECH, is presented in three chapters of 186 pages. The chapters treat respectively Story-telling, Interpretative

Reading, and Dramatics. Part Three, ORIGINAL SPEECH, in four chapters of 215 pages, treats; (1) Conversation; (2) Parliamentary Practice; (3) Original Speech; (4) Debating. The book contains thirty-one illustrations, has a comprehensive bibliography at the end of the chapters on story-telling and dramatics, and is well indexed.

The authors have shown good judgment and skill in selecting the essential matter to present and in compressing it into such clear and concise language. One finds in this book much that has been missed in texts purporting to cover the same ground. This is especially noticeable in the amplitude of the space devoted to phonetics which occupies almost one-half of part one: in the number, variety, and literary quality of the selections for interpretative reading; in the helpful suggestions for speech organization; in the fullness of the material for parliamentary practice; and in the thorough way in which the subject of debate is treated. Teachers will find abundance of suggestive exercises at the close of each chapter which they can use, if desired, in making practical application of the theory.

One will not find anything strikingly new in this book unless it be the simplicity of the language. It has occurred to the reviewer many times to wonder why the writers of text-books on speech did not better exemplify their own theory of adapting themselves to their readers. Here is a book that has attempted to do so. The book is intended to be read and understood by high school students. What will recommend the book strongly to those seeking a text-book to serve as a basis for a broad survey course is that it is comprehensive and concise without being fragmentary; it is a book that the students will be likely to enjoy studying and will want to keep after the course is ended: and it is reasonable in price.

If one were disposed to assume the office of a critic to be that of a fault finder he could find things in the book to which he could take exception. Personally I do not agree with the writer of the chapter on debate that "debate is merely a game of wits" and that "it is absurd to suppose that any school activity can determine the fate of nations or even of small communities." I do not even think the writer agrees with herself else why should she say that a proposition such as, "Resolved, that the pen is mightier than the sword," is not a suitable proposition for debate; and why should

she recommend questions of social, economic and educational purport? Where, if not in the school room are the questions of the nation to be settled rightly or wisely? The above proposition is as good as any for a trial of wits and it allows one more time for planning strategy and trickery by requiring less study and research. I prefer to think that debating is primarily a means of determining what is right and wise.

In the otherwise careful treatment of parliamentary practice the author points out that a two-thirds vote is necessary in order to carry the motion for the Previous Question and then proceeds to call for a vive voce vote instead of a show of hands. These minor faults are insignificant as compared with the outstanding merits of the book. It is a book which will recommend itself to teachers and will no doubt enjoy a large sale. The authors and publishers are alike be be congratulated.

W. J. KAY, *West Virginia University*

Argumentation. By JAMES A. WINANS and WILLIAM E. UTTERBACK. New York: Century Company, 1930; pp. xii, 462; $2.25.

The authors describe this book as "an attempt to write a thoroughly practical treatise on argument." They have consequently confined their discussions to two major problems: "What are the laws of inference by which the mind travels rationally from premise to conclusion?" and, "How may these laws be applied in influencing thought and conduct?" The attack on these problems is made through statement of general principles rather than by recommendation of formulae and rules.

Logical and Psychological aspects af the process of thought and conduct form the basis for Part I, including such topics as "The Proposition," "Analysis of the Proposition," "Proof requirements of a Thesis," "Types of Argument, (Deduction, Generalization, Analogy)" "Citations of Authority," "Refutation," "Beliefs of the Audience as Basic Premises," "Attitude of the Audience toward the Speaker, toward the Proposition," "Interest," and "Exposition." Suggestions for going about the business of selecting a subject, gathering material, and planning and delivering the speech make up Part II. An appendix of illustrative speeches and a first-rate index complete the volume.

"Argumentation" should be a valuable textbook in a general

course in public speaking as well as one specialized for controversial forms of discourse. Not only the selection of material but, also its arrangement have made it a reservoir of information easily accessible to even the novice in speech-making. To the instructor who wishes to reduce the formal textbook requirements of his course to a minimum in order to enable the student to engage in speech-making projects as soon as possible this book is a god-send. Especially is it well-adapted to classes enrolling students varying greatly in background and ability.

In their efforts "to include nothing that will not be of practical value to the student" the authors have omitted chapters dealing with evidence, debate and principles of composition. The teacher of mature students probably will miss the discussions of evidence but "Argumentation" used with Professor Winan's previous text on "Public Speaking" (that enclyclopedia of speech-making) will make a combination adaptable to the needs of freshmen as well as to students in a graduate school of speech. The principles of argumentation set down in this volume will be ample equipment from which to build both debates and public discussion. No bias in favor of any one type of address such as public discussion, conference speaking, or English debate is present. The book is essentially a text in the established principles of thinking with an audience toward a conclusion. To the coach and the instructor in classes in general speech-making as well as to the student it offers a valuable and adaptable laboratory manual.

E. D. McDowell, *Columbia University*

Modern Oratory. By the Right Hon. Lord Hewart of Bury. The English Association, Pamphlet No. 74, 1929; 13 pp.

This presidential address before the English Association contains more than its share of wisdom and learning, and shows its noble author, England's Chief Justice, to be thoroughly conversant with both ancient and modern oratory. "A good deal of nonsense is in fact written, and possibly believed, even by the writers, upon the effortless spontaneity of modern oratory. . . . The speaker of to-day, impelled by a thirst for glory, or a hunger for fees, or conceivably perhaps by the simple desire to do his duty to the best of his ability, may not deliberately and systematically addict himself to the Attic, the Asiatic, or the Rodian school. But whether he likes

it or not, and, moreover, whether he knows it or not, he enters upon an arena where the contest has been marked out, and the rules have been laid down, once for all, by men of genius like Aristotle and Hermagoras, Quintilian, and Cornificius." His remarks under other heads, such as the modern "passion for relevancy" and "the unrivalled efficacy of plain speech" are equally pungent and pertinent.

H. H. H.

University of Michigan Plays. Edited by KENNETH THORPE ROWE, with an Introduction by LOUIS A. STRAUSS. Ann Arbor: George Wahr, 1929; pp. xiii, 169.

This volume is more interesting for what it is than for what it contains. It represents the publication of five plays written by members of the course in Play-writing, Rhetoric 189, at the University of Michigan. Four of the plays were produced by students in Play Production. As the work of students, engaged in a coöperative enterprise, it merits praise; but the plays themselves hardly add to dramatic literature in the one-act form. "Outside This Room" shows some sensitivity and understanding, but it does not manage to make its action of characters seem important. It is conspicuously derivative from European models. "Passion's Progress" attempts the clever, somewhat Arlenesque drawing-room comedy, but doesn't bring it off. "My Man" is closer to something real and important than the preceding, but demands too much of any actors who try to carry off the crowded, tragic ending. "The Joiners" is most successful of all these, not trying to do any more than it can do. It is a jovial satire on zoologically named fraternal orders. "Puppet" is near-Kreymborg,—very dainty and, of course, whimsical; decorative, too, but as Professor Strauss points out, impossible of production. But this is a hopeful start.

H. H. H.

Mental Aspects of Stammering. BY C. S. BLUEMEL, M. A., M. D., L. R. C. P. (Lond.) M. R. C. S. (Eng.); Baltimore, The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1930: pp. 145, and index.

The author of this interesting book speaks to us from the neu-

rological clinic of the School of Medicine of the University of Colorado at Denver.

For many years the mention of speech correction in the great Rocky Mountain country has instantly called to mind the name of Bluemel, and his theories of "momentary amnesia" as an explanation of the phenomenon of stuttering. In this connection we should mention his former work. *Stammering and Cognate Defects of Speech,* published in 1913. The present book is not to be understood fully except in the light of that earlier treatise, in which the great body of the author's theory is containued.

In a sense the new book is misnamed. It would have been more accurate, perhaps, to have described it as a "Manual on the Treatment of Stuttering," for less than fifty pages of this book are devoted to direct discussion of "Mental Aspects of Stammering." The larger part of the work consists of methods for the training of stuttering patients. This should by no means be understood as an adverse criticism of the book but only as a suggestion as to the inadequacy of the title. It is high time that some one should gird up his loins, fasten on his armor, and venture forth into the open with a frank and detailed explanation of how he treats the stutterer. It shows a commendable motive and a professional spirit.

We learned the other day of a physican who refused to divulge to the world the formula for a certain medicine that was obviously successful in reducing inflamations of the tonsils. Dr. Bluemel's attitude contrasts with that of this physician. He not only explains his methods but illustrates them profusely with photographs.

In the portion of the book devoted to a discussion of theory the author seems to show the influence of modern psychiatry upon his former theory. He still emphasizes the factor of amnesia in stuttering. If there is any new feature of theory, it is his explanation of the "momentary" appearance of this amnesia. He has evidently adopted the psychoneurotic or hysterical etiology as an explanation. Stammering is a repression of consciousness,—a disturbance of thought and it manifests itself in speech merely because speech reproduces thought, declares Bluemel in substance. Perhaps he stretches his theory a bit too far, when on page 32 he explains cardiospasm as a form of stammering. It were easy to follow his analogies between glottal spasm and spasm of the cardiac sphincter if one could forget his theory that stammering is a re-

pression of consciousness or a defect of thinking, but how consciousness or the lack of it is connected with the spasm of the plain musculature of the stomach he does not make clear.

Again in arguing that in stammering is mental in causation, Dr. Buemel seems to strain his theory to fit the facts (page 9):

"There can be no congenital defect of speech organs," he writes "when the stammerer speaks fluently for the first several years of his life."

The fact that a dysfunction does not manifest itself at once in the development of the child is no good argument against its organic or physiologic causation. Very often congenital luetic infections of the nervous system do not show themselves until years after birth. To argue that congenital syphilis is not congenital, because it does not show up at once, would be analogous to the argument here presented.

To review the book in brief we should say: attractively manufactured, interestingly written, setting forth with admirable professional frankness, both theory and practice.

ROBERT WEST, *University of Wisconsin*

Why English Sounds Change. By JANET RANKIN AIKEN, PH. D. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1929. vii + 146 pp.

Students of historical and comparative linguistics have long been familiar with the principal facts of phonetic change. The modifications of sounds during the history of any single language and the relationships between sounds of different languages have been in large measure ascertained and codified in statements of empirical fact. These statements are accepted by all linguists of repute, and have the dignity of scientific facts. Thus no one doubts that the vowel [ɑ:] in Old English *stān* has developed into [o:] in Modern English *stone,* or that it is cognate with the diphthong [ɑɪ] in Modern German *Stein* [ʃtɑɪn]. But when linguists seek an explanation of the causes of these changes there is no such unanimity of opinion. Inability or unwillingness to relate speech to its physiological basis has led to some wild guesses, and the more prudent linguists have in most cases been willing to take the facts without any explanation.

It is perhaps unfair to say that Mrs. Aiken has attempted to

find explanations which have eluded many competent linguists, for such a statement magnifies the difficulty of the problem by implying that linguists have used the best possible methods, whereas we know that linguists have usually been less certain of the physiological processes involved in speech than of any other aspect of the subject. Mr. Aiken, on the other hand, explains phonetic changes with constant reference to the physiological processes involved. Thus the change from [stɑ:n] to [sto:n] and that from Old English *scēap* to Modern English *sheep* each involve a shortening of the distance through which the tongue moves. Mrs. Aiken has given the name "accord" to the principle whereby she explains the illustrations given above as well as many others. Her definition of the principle follows:

"Accord in speech may be defined briefly as that principle whereby a speaker tends to harmonize speech sounds. In another aspect, it may be termed the tendency of spoken language to become progressively more simplified, hence more efficient in its sound patterns. More specifically, accord is that principle in language by whose operation sounds tend to repeat or to approach in manner or place of production, other sounds, whether immediately contiguous in utterance or more remote." (pp. 22-23.)

It will be seen that accord includes, but is somewhat broader in scope than, assimilation, which is most usually defined as the process whereby one sound is changed to another under the influence of a third. This definition of assimilation corresponds very closely with what Mrs. Aiken terms approximation accord. Other types which she recognizes are ablation accord, mutation accord, and recurrence accord. Ablation involves the loss of sounds which do not harmonize with the general sound pattern of the language, for example the loss in English of the voiceless back fricative in Scotch and German *Loch*. Mutation is another term for the familiar *umlaut* process. Recurrence involves the repetition of sounds in such diverse phenomena as the expressions *pell-mell, helter-skelter,* reduplicating verbs, and formal alliteration in Old English poetry. Numerous diagrams illustrate the various aspects of the principle, and it must be confessed that the author has made accord seem very reasonable. Nor does she limit herself to this one principle. Other factors, which are grouped under the headings of grading, conservation, and the intellectual

element, have a part to play, though it is a less important part, and need not be considered here.

One fact which Mrs. Aiken attempts to explain by the principle of approximation accord is the so-called raising of English tense vowels, that is, the process whereby tense vowels in Old English have been replaced in Modern English by vowels higher in the conventional, though perhaps incorrect, vowel triangle. Specifically, we know that there has been a change from [æ] toward [ɛ], [e], and [i], and from [ɑ] toward [ɔ], [o], and [u]. Mrs. Aiken believes that the change was brought about through the proximity of high consonants, and that it was caused by a tendency of the tongue to move through a shorter distance in articulating the combination of vowel and consonant. But what happened to Old English [i] and [u]? They were already at the top of the vowel triangle, and in Modern English have become the diphthongs [aɪ] and a*v*]. Thus Old English *īs* [i:s] has become Modern English *ice* [aɪs], and Old English *nū* [nu:] has become Modern English *now* [na*v*]. If the [ɑ:] in Old English *stān* has been changed to [o:] in Modern English *stone* by a process of shortening the distance through which the tongue moves, why should *ice* and *now*, and many similar words, be pronounced today with a much longer movement of the tongue than seems to have been necessary in Old English? Since the high consonants occur in *ice* and *now* as well asin *stone, sea,* and the other words with which Mrs. Aiken illustrates her principles, one wonders whether they are not perhaps irrelevant in the change, and whether the explanation of the raising of English vowels must not be sought elsewhere.

There is one minor detail to which the present reviewer objects, and that is the consistent use of [ɑɪ] for [aɪ] in representing the diphthong in such words as *ice* and *fine*. This suggests the dialectal pronunciation heard in New York City rather than the standard American pronunciation which the author takes as her norm for Modern English. One might also take exception to the following statement: "In all the words where [æ] alternates with [ɑ], professional speech experts (elocutionists) will advise pronouncing [ɑ]. Indeed, the sound [æ] is regarded by such teachers as definitely distasteful and reprehensible wherever avoidance of it is found possible." (p. 15.)

The value of the book is twofold. To the linguist it should

emphasize the importance of the physiological background of speech and of experimental phonetics. To the teacher of speech and of elocution it should make possible, where necessary, a somewhat more liberal attitude toward assimilations and good speech than is to be found in the advice: "Say [ɛdjukeʃn]; the pronunciation [ɛdʒukeʃn] is vulgar! "More than this, the book is interestingly written and should stimulate the imagination of all students of speech.

C. K. THOMAS, *Cornell University*

The Way of the Drama. By BRUCE CARPENTER. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1929; pp. 263. $2.50.

A Book of Dramas. Arranged and edited by BRUCE CARPENTER. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1929; pp. 1,115. $3.50.

Bruce Carpenter is a teacher of playwriting and a dramatic critic. As professor of English in New York University, Mr. Carpenter has been able to build up in the minds of a large body of students a finer taste and appreciation for things of the stage and the drama. *The Way of the Drama* is a book that has grown out of the writer's experience as a student, lecturer, and professional actor. In a narrative and chatty manner the basic principles of drama are explained; also, it is easily seen that the author has in mind, not so much the creative artist, but audiences—those of us who like to attend, to read, and to interpret plays with some sort of intelligent enjoyment. The foundations of the text are by no means new; the fundamental laws, which underlie the growth, development and study of the various forms of drama, are here collected in the space of one volume. Furthermore, they are discussed and presented in such a pleasant style that even the academic footnotes have been made palatable (I believe that I read them all). I should like to recommend the book to play producers and teachers of drama for two specific reasons: first, the subject matter is sound; second, the whole thing is so agreeably written that the dramatic principles of Aristotle and other weighty critics have been offered in such a way as to make them appear positively enjoyable.

Mr. Carpenter has taken up the outstanding forms of the drama: tragedy, comedy, farce, and melodrama; also, he has treated as moods those plays which are classified as realistic, sentimental, naturalistic, expressionistic, etc. The separate chapters are

filled with an abundance of illustrations. Perhaps, it is in his choice of illustrations and examples that the author displays his most original work. Being a teacher of Speech, I am continually crying aloud in my class-room for "examples" that are *real, human, and related to the subject and audience;* Mr. Carpenter's discussion of drama satisfies my passion for the general and specific illustration. He has grown up in the theatre; he has observed its life on stage and off, with the consequence that he cites all sorts of anecdotes, comments and examples that one is not very likely to find in any other book of this kind. The chapters on the little theatre movement, stage censorship, and the future of the theatre bring to a close a very interesting volume. Personally, I regret most of all that this is a text-book, for I know that Mr. Carpenter can do something with greater scope and power.

A Book of Dramas goes hand-in-hand with *The Way of the Drama;* It is an anthology of plays, illustrating the forms and moods discussed in the other volume. There are plays representing every period from the Greek to the present day. The compiler has chosen masterpieces of modern drama; also, his translations of the classics and foreign plays are the best available. The extensive biographical notes and bibliographies to be found in each of these books show fine scholarship and discrimination.

ROBERT HANNAH, *Hunter College*

August Strindberg: The Bedeviled Viking. BY V. J. MCGILL. New York: Brentano's, 1930; pp. 454.

When the reviewer was a youngster, he devoured with the keenest enjoyment a thrilling tale of that Scandinavian warrior of old, Prince Olaf the Glorious—a Viking who, with his sword, conquered towns and peoples, who subdued his foes and gained the fear and respect of his friends; a warrior whose motto seemed to be: "No compromise with god or devil!" Dr. McGill's life-story of August Strindberg is the *saga* of a modern warrior—a bedeviled Viking—who like the Scandinavian Prince of long ago won his victories, his weapon being, not the sword, but the pen. For Strindberg "stormed across Europe, worshipper and hater of women, expounder of Nietzsche and Swedenborg, hardened materialist and seeker of the Philosopher's Stone." When he died in 1912, he was buried in his native city of Stockholm with all the honors of a hero.

Even as the giants of the past, he gained a niche in Valhalla, the palace of immortality. Dr. McGill does well to compare Strindberg with Tamburlaine. For like Tamburlaine, Strindberg besieged many towns and was acquainted with many moods. Negotiating peacefully, Tamburlaine's banners were white; aroused to anger, the banners were red; crazed to war and destruction, the banners became black. Strindberg's most caustic onslaught against society was *The Red Room*, and his most savage one *Black Flags*.

The writer of this biography has drawn very clearly upon Strindberg's own plays and novels for an interpretation of his character. Probably few playwrights have put more of themselves, more that is personal and autobiographical, into their dramas. It was an important quality of Strindberg's writing from the beginning, with such plays as *In Rome* and *The Free-thinker*, that it concerned itself with problems in which he himself was ardently involved. Starting with these early plays, McGill has given us very clear and interesting analyses, together with excellent commentaries, of the chief works of the dramatist. As a book for the student and producer of drama, this study of Strindberg should not be neglected. Apart from its entertaining qualities as a piece of splendidly written biography, this book is a real contribution to scholarship and the interpretation of the life and work of Sweden's greatest dramatist and man of letters. Dr. McGill's style is lively; he has a nice imaginative sense which carries the reader. Even in his discursive passages there is so much sound information that the writer can be forgiven for wandering a bit.

Reference has been made to Dr. McGill's discursive method. This is quite apparent. Still, the book combines exciting narrative and a philosophical approach to the unfolding of one of the most complex and contradictory personalities in the world of letters. Strindberg resembled Tolstoi and Rousseau in that his life seemed to be one continual self-confession. First of all, he was dominated by science and evolutionary naturalism, skepticism and atheism, and in 1896 he was converted and studied the theology of Swedenborg, and out of the latter experience grew a new dramatic form revealed in his drama *Toward Damascus*. If the earlier dramas reveal the poet's desire for realism and naturalism, this latter work is "a chronicle of the author's own spiritual crisis, his damnation, expiation and conversion." It is autobiographical:—first,

it is only a diary of a mad unhappy genius; again, it is a Morality Play portraying the struggles of man for heavenly joys—a sort of pilgrimage in search of happiness against his own sins and the temptations of the world. This blending of naturalism with the mystical and symbolic is a dramatic discovery of note. Strindberg used it effectively; it was also developed by Ibsen, Hauptmann, and Maeterlinck.

To return to Strindberg's earlier work. Many of the more liberal critics had been trained to accept the radical dramas of Ibsen and Zola. Yet, these same critics were wholly unprepared for Strindberg's plays, where the playwright's passion for the gruesome and horrible was never quenched; the critics felt that such dramas as *The Father* and *Miss Julia* could come only from the pen of mad-man. As Dr. McGill points out: "Everything that Strindberg touched turned to dross—all the cherished ideals. If there were circumstances in human life which were delicate and unapproachable, protected from scrutiny by accepted lies and pretexts, Strindberg was sure to uncover the deceit." It is well known that, during the presentation of some of his plays, people were so filled with horror and personal insult they left the theatre. His language, at times, was saturated with the spirit of revenge and vindictiveness. However, Strindberg's language was only a symbol of his daring; besides, he was abnormally sensitive, a nervously tense and discontented soul. Time has brought changes. Perhaps *The Father, Miss Julia,* and *The Dance of Death* don't disturb us so much; at any rate, they are being put on the stage with continually increasing success.

Bernard Shaw and other critics have asserted that Ibsen and Strindberg are the dominant and basic figures in present-day drama. If this be so, Strindberg has scarcely been given his due in this country, at least. Rarely, have his plays been presented. In all, he has written fifty-six plays of almost every mood and type, historical, mystical, religious, symbolical, and naturalistic. Back in the "80's" Strindberg, practically by himself, created and developed the drama of naturalism, but we forget he did more than write realistic and naturalistic plays. When the names of such men as Ibsen, Hauptmann, Tchekhoff, Rice, and O'Neill are heard everywhere; when *Street Scene, The Cherry Orchard,* and *Desire Under the Elms* are frequently discussed, we might do well to return

to the master of realism and naturalism, August Strindberg. And we know that Eugene O'Neill was definitely influenced by Strindberg; in preparing himself for the work of a dramatist, O'Neill read "practically all the classics and of course the moderns, Ibsen and Strindberg, especially Strindberg." Incidentally, Dr. McGill's chapter on "naturalism" is particularly illuminating and clear, and should be investigated by those interested in this phase of drama.

Dr. McGill tells some interesting things about Strindberg's personal relation to the stage and theatre. For several years, during the early part of the present century, the Stockholm theatres refused to produce Strindberg's plays. Also, he had twenty-five dramas that had never been performed. This caused the playwright no end of annoyance. However, fortune smiled, when in 1907 the Strindberg Theatre, or *The Intime Theatre* was founded. The dream of a life-time was achieved, and the dramatist was happy. McGill's description of this *Intime Theatre* will be good reading for the "little theatre" producer. A small theatre, devised and built for the presentation of short, vital plays with the minimum number of characters. There were no footlights—Strindberg hated footlights—he felt that they severed the intimate bond that should exist between the actors and the audience.... However, this is merely a review; the book should be read as a whole. Strindberg was familiar with the "little theatre" movement in Germany—a movement which incorporated many of his own ideas, and a movement to which he added no small amount. His own *Intime Theatre* was the result.

ROBERT HANNAH, *Hunter College*

Make-Up. BY JOHN F. BAIRD. New York; Samuel French, 1930; pp. x, 155.

The author has produced a very practical book for students of make-up in schools and colleges. The style is simple, direct, and concrete. He covers all of the standard topics as indicated by the following list of chapter headings: Application and Removal; Shaping and Reshaping the Face; Make-Up Other Than Facial; Hair, Wigs, and Beards; Juvenile; Middle Age; Old Age; Fantastic and Grotesque; Concert and Readings; Movie; Nationalities. He

has added a chapter on Expressionistic and Impressionistic make-up which discusses adaptation to those forms of interpretation.

Probably the most helpful part of the book is in the formulae which he gives at the end of nearly every chapter. These give the beginning student something definite to guide him in working out his make-up problems.

Appendix A contains the manufacturers' names and addresses with the numbers and names of their products. Appendix B suggests individual, group, and combination kits.

The book does not have an index, but the table of contents is so well outlined that it really does not need one. A few more sketches could have been included, especially for the nationalities.

LEON MCCARTY, *University of Illinois*

Parliamentary Law. By EDITH THEALL CHAFEE, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1930. 114 pp.

This book is a contribution to the field of parliamentary law. It differs from most previous texts in two general respects; it is written in such simple style, and covers the subject in such an elementary way that the most inexperienced reader may readily apply its material to parliamentary procedure in his own organization; and it outlines the reasons for the rules which are given, thus providing a foundation upon which a thorough understanding of the subject may be based.

It is a small and carefully indexed book. There is also a chart which gives the precedence of parliamentary motions.

CARL TAYLOR, *University of Wisconsin*

The Nervous Child. By HECTOR CHARLES CAMERON, M. A., M. D., F. R. C. P. New York. Oxford University Press, 1929: pp. 236.

Perhaps the best way to indicate that this book is up to the minute in its information is to quote from the prefaces to the various editions. The book first appeared in 1919 when the movement for prevention of disease was just gaining headway, and when mental prophylaxis was being urged upon those responsible for the welfare of children. At that time Dr. Cameron wrote:

"More and more a considerable part of the profession must

busy itself in nurseries and in schools, seeking to apply there the teachings of Psychology, Physiology, Heredity, and Hygiene. To work of this kind, in some of its aspects, this book may serve as an introduction. It deals with the influences which mould the mentality of the child and shape his conduct.

There was no preface to the second edition, but in April, 1924, the author wrote:

"In this Third Edition I have endeavored to illustrate the chapter entitled, 'Nervousness and Physique', by photographs of well-marked examples of the different types described. I have in part re-written that chapter."

The latest step in the evolution of this book was taken in September, 1929, when he incorporated into it material about a subject that at present is insistently elbowing its way into journals on pedology, pediatrics, mental hygiene, and nervous disorders. The well informed in these subjects today must be conversant with their biochemical aspects; so Dr. Cameron writes in his preface to the fourth edition:

"I have added a chapter entitled, 'The Underlying Disturbances of Metabolism in the Nervous Child.' I have felt the need of some extent to explain the very constant association in the nervous child of disturbances of conduct and disturbances of metabolism."

Dr. Cameron is a pediatrician in charge of the Children's Department of Guy's Hospital, and he writes this book out of the fullness of his experience in that type of practice. The book is non-technical. For those of us who are dealing with nervous children exhibiting speech disorders as a symptom of nervousness, it is a helpful book; and it is particularly useful as a book to which inquiring parents and teachers may be referred for advice on many problems of child nature, such as: misconduct, want of appetite, indigestion, want of sleep, enuresis, nervousness in early infancy, nervousness in older children, the metabolism of the nervous child, the nervous child in sickness, education on sexual matter, the nervous child in school, corrective diets, etc.

The book is provided with a comprehensive index.

ROBERT WEST, *University of Wisconsin*

The Mirror of Gesture, the Abhinaya Darpana of Nandikesvara, translated into English. By Ananda Coomaraswamy and Gopala Kristnayya Duggirala. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1917. 52 pages, 15 plates.

Greenleaf Theater Elements. I. Action. By Constance Smedley. Duckworth and Company, Covent Gardens, London, W. C. 1925. 61-78 pages.

The Art of Pantomime. By Charles Aubert, translated into English. By Edith Sears. Henry Holt and Company. New York, 1927. $3.50. 210 pages, 196 diagrams.

The Technique of Pantomime. By Florence Lutz. The Sather Gate Book Shop, Berkley, California. 1927. $2.25. 174 pages.

The above four books form an interesting group and for many a valuable one. *L' Art Mimique* was written by Charles Aubert in 1901. Only recently Edith Sears translated it into English.

The first six pages of the book, a division called General Ideas, are a set of definitions, the most important of which, as far as this art of pantomime is concerned, are the first and the last; namely, "The language of dumbshow is universal"; "....apart from a few indicative and descriptive signs, dramatic movements express only verbs, nothing but verbs." Then follow exercises for Suppleness, Movements of the Body and its Members, Analysis of the Muscles of the Face, Analysis of the Movements of the Hands, Expressions of the Entire Head, Passive Expressions. These are carried out in black and white diagrams, numbering nearly two hundred, which are very simple and easy to follow. Each diagram is briefly described. The diagrams are an effective method of tabulation.

The second part of the book deals more with the art of pantomime. In Aubert's opinion a pantomime properly written, staged and acted, causes a "mysterious emotion akin to that experienced in dreams." Chapters on how to register the parts of speech, problems, and on writing, translating and staging a pantomime are useful, but being only a part of the whole book, cannot give a wealth of material on their various phases. They do serve however as a starting point for those who wish to begin a study of this form of drama.

The Technique of Pantomime is a book more directly for the

student than is *The Art of Pantomime.* It is what its names implies, technique; what to do and how and when to do it. Miss Lutz wrote her book in 1927, twenty-six years after Aubert. Both writers agree that the bodily expression of man is a mode of communication which is universal. Whereas Aubert has developed his diagrams and tabulations around verb forms, e. g. *to be happy*—Miss Lutz does all her tabulations on nouns e. g. *joy.* In other words, Aubert is putting his students upon the stage in pantomime, while Miss Lutz is still in the preparatory steps before the stage is reached.

The Technique of Pantomime is based on the theory that an actor's body must have skill in expression which can be obtained only through knowledge and training. The tables are divided into Individual Expressive Actions, in which eyes, nose, lips, jaw, head, torso,. . . .are considered individually; Sympathetic Expressive Actions, in which are grouped those parts of the body which act similarly and sympathetically, while others are in repose or in contrasting expression; Sustained Expressive Actions, consisting of acting as a whole; Combined Expressive Actions, of which six only are given as examples which the actor may multiply as his needs arise.

One hundred and twenty-seven emotions or situations have been chosen: admiration, belief, depreciation, eagerness, prayer, suspense, worry, to choose a few at random. They are listed alphabetically under the general headings eyes, head, torso. . . .and by each emotion the position is analyzed. Thus she has compiled in easy form, the detailed physical attitudes of these emotions. Aubert gives us forty diagrams of detailed analysis of the muscles of the face; Lutz gives us written statements for five hundred and ten emotions or shades of emotions, a work far more detailed and perhaps too complicated. Her system of tabulation has been done advisedly in order to form progressive exercises for the student; for she believes that we acquire ability to control muscles as we acquire a vocabulary.

She gives us nothing new in her first few chapters on the training of the actor and methods of study, unless it be a new thought to the professional actor that a study of the history of the drama is the first thing to consider! These chapters comprise only

the first thirty-three pages; the remaining one hundred and forty pages are devoted to the tables.

Miss Lutz has dedicated her book to Dr. S. S. Curry, her teacher. Curry was a student and devotee of Steele MacKaye, the Delsartean expert. MacKaye wrote and often said that he did not number the expressions of the face to so many hundreds and thousands. The idea that expressions could be so tabulated met with his, "Nonsense." The keyword to his teaching, if there can be one, is progression. He showed the progression or the transitions from a certain emotion through several shades or degrees to the final expression of the emotion toward which he was leading. Curry's books give this same feeling of progression—beginning-with-this-phase-and-going-on-to-the-next-without giving any definite patterns or forms.

If Miss Lutz, a pupil of Dr. Curry's intended to convey this quality, she has been unfortunate in her attempt. She has tabulated what Delsarte would say was impossible to tabulate. In alphabetical order she has listed certain emotions and written a description of the muscular positions as they would be when the height or the perfection of that emotion was reached. She gives, in other words, "so many faces." Perhaps it is impossible to verbalize these emotions in any better way; perhaps emotions can be caught only through the showing, although even here, the student stands in a fair way to fall a victim to the evils of imitation. The student, therefore, beginning his work with Miss Lutz's book would miss the essential element in his practice work and not realize that pantomimic expression is not so many perfect poses, but the progression from one emotional state to the perfection of the next emotion and on out of that one. Expression does not go by tabulated jerks, but rather by a smooth progression and transition.

If on the other hand, the student is already grounded in pantomimic expression and wants a book which will serve as an index reminder to help him in his work, then *The Technique of Pantomime* may prove a useful volume. Miss Lutz does save herself by saying that the actor, before making an intensive study of pantomime must prepare himself with a good working basis composed of as much knowledge as can be acquired by reading and observation. The value of her book then is relative to the pre-

paration of the student; and it would probably, therefore, create the wrong impression and prove harmful to the beginner.

Miss Lutz makes a case against the study of pantomime from pictures in that the student is looking at an individual illustration of the emotion rather than the natural expression of it. Aubert has given his descriptions through the medium of line drawings which are much better than actual photographs, yet even there the dangers of imitation are lurking. Aubert gives the final expression and only the brief second of it at its height, forgetting almost entirely the progression to that final stage.

Actors are not given a certain emotion to express at a certain time. They must beware of an artificial tabulation. They must remember that it is not so much the nth degree of emotion they are to register, as it is the gradual assumption of that degree. In order to do this the body must, of course, be under rigid control, and it is practice and exercise that makes and keeps it so. In so far as they furnish such practical exercises, books of pantomime are useful.

Where then shall the actor begin? Constance Smedley has probably furnished the textbook for the amateur and the beginner. It is a little book in the *Greenleaf Theater Elements* called *Action*, the first of a series of textbooks on play production and acting.

The author set out to write a book that would "aid original observation, intention and expression, rather than provide formulas which can be followed without thinking." Like Miss Lutz, she has builded her book on the principle that all gesture must be practiced, or subtle expression is practically impossible to portray. Miss Smedley makes a very pertinent remark that though an actor may lose himself in his part and become unconscious of his audience, his audience is ever fully conscious of him.

On the basis that every actor must study the action of his part as consistently as he does the lines, makeup or costume, the book is divided into seven steps. The first is the mental makeup, the concept of the role quite apart from the actor's responsibility; the second is Classification, a concept of the character's age, parentage, upbringing, chief characteristics; the third, first steps, begins practical expression, how to walk, how to use feet and legs; the fourth, how to gesture with arm and shoulder; the fifth, hand and fingers; the sixth, the torso; the seventh, head and eyes. Each of these

groups are analyzed around some play. Instead of letting the student imagine situations, Miss Smedley gives actual plays, analyzes the action in each as befitting that character, and shows the student a method whereby he can study other plays.

The exercises given in this little book take the student directly onto the stage in actual situations, which is a method more interesting than exercises of emotions more in the abstract. It is her theory that the Greenleaf Theater arouses thought; and directly people start thinking, they always show individuality. Miss Smedley agrees with Miss Lutz that "....it is what the actor suggests rather than what he represents that creates the illusion."[1] The methods differ. The detailed technique is left out. Miss Smedley starts the student or amateur actor thinking along the right direction and leaves him to work out his part according to his own individuality. The result is probably happier than had he tried to use the more technical books which belong to the advanced student. He is not building an annoying artificiality in trying to assume certain set forms. The patterns or forms in Miss Smedley's book are the simplest and most elemental.

It is true that once the beginner has made a start he will want to look somewhere for further and more detailed information than *Action* affords. If his search starts after he has realized the value and relative importance of Miss Smedley's seven steps, and can appreciate the degree of importance to be attached to the tabulated and pictured forms, the student will be able to find help in Miss Lutz and Mr. Aubert. If he starts before he is somewhat grounded, the help he receives will not prove useful in producing the desired results. The two more technical books will find their rightful place on the actor's reference shelf, and no doubt many teachers and actors will find them very useful as reference books.

The Mirror of Gesture brings with it a decidedly new atmosphere It is a translation from the ancient Sanskrit of the laws of dancing, as declared by Nandikesvara. The art of dancing and acting was set forth in a complicated work on dramatic science. This has not been translated as yet. *The Mirror of Gesture* is a shorter compendium of it.

In the India of those days nothing of this sort was left to chance, mood or imagination, so both acting and dancing may well

[1] Technique of Pantomime, p. 4.

be considered as deliberative arts. They were very complicated and required that the audience appreciate and understand the sign language. Such a rigorous training as this art required precluded any amateur acting.

The three elements of bodily gesture are the limbs, parts of the body, and the features. There are gestures carefully written out, not so different from Aubert and Lutz, for thirty-three heads, fifty-two glances, six brows, four necks, twenty-eight hands though it is said there are as many as there are meanings, and so on through the lists.

By way of comparison, I took at random the emotion humility or modesty, with this result:

Aubert:	Bending the head. Drooping the eyelids.
Lutz:	Bend head slowly before the object.
Coomaraswamy:	The head is bent.

These books were written in 1927, 1901, and sometime before 1000. The language of pantomime must be universal and eternal!

In a short introduction, Mr. Coomaraswamy gives a few quotations from the larger work, showing the traditional origin of the drama as created in Paradise and sent to Earth. In a series of plates in the back of the book we find some photographs and drawings of a few of the most difficult positions. Aside from the regular gestures, there were special signs to indicate various things. This special language is peculiar to India and the art of such acting has all but disappeared.

A. K. Coomaraswamy, a well-known Sanksrit scholar, and one of the translators, is well qualified for his work. The Sanskrit is difficult and the language necessitates a knowedge of Indian manners and customs. With his Engish schooling, he is able to make the Western readers understand this subject to a considerable degree.

This is a book which is perhaps of more interest to the student of the science of action, than to the potential actor. Unless the student has sufficient background and knowledge of India and the Indian way of doing things, it is doubtful if it would be very helpful even for the production of Oriental plays. It is nevertheless highly interesting and has a significant bearing on dramatic history.

EMILY GILCHRIST HATCH, *Travancore, India*

Middletown. By Robert and Helen Lynd. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

A book which gives an objective treatment of the education, experience, primary interests and mood of the average American audience is a book that should appeal to the teacher of Public Speaking. *Middletown,* an analysis by Robert and Helen Lynd of one hundred and twenty-four laborer's families and forty business families of an average and actual Middle-Western industrial city, is such a book.

The honesty of this scientific attempt to present "a cross section of the activities of a community of today" is guaranteed by the fact that the findings were made by five trained social investigators working over a period of one and a half years in an attempt to discover the true status of the average American citizen. Their investigations fall into six main divisions: Getting A Living, Making A Home, Training The Young, Using Leisure, Engaging In Religious Practices, and Community Activities.

Some of the most important results of this survey may be summarized here, although it should be emphasized that the study has a wealth of detailed information that should be examined and pondered over by any one who is facing the American public.

"Getting A Living" in some highly-routinized, specialized occupation forms the chief interest of Midldetown. Forty-three out of every one hundred individuals in this city are primarily engaged in this activity. Earning a living is becoming more and more precarious and as a result more important, because highly-routinized industry does away with most individual initiative, thus creating more poorly trained workers who can easily be replaced. This is one of the main problems of the city.

In the sections devoted to "Making The Home" and "Training The Young" increased specific differences between the working class and the business class are brought out. These consist mainly of the following: (1) Place roots of the working class are much more shallow than those of the business class, (2) High school and college attendance is taken for granted among the business class, while the working class considers it as a means of salvation or a religion. There are, however, some problems which face both classes in somewhat the same fashion. Both classes feel that old standards of morality do not meet the present situation—but neither of them

know what to do about it. For example both working class and business class complain about the growth of social life and decline of educational requirements in the high schools, yet neither one will allow outsiders to criticize their school system. The Rotary Club and Chamber of Commerce prevent that.

"Using Leisure" is probably the most interesting section in the book. In this field American life has changed more than in any other. Lectures, concerts and reading clubs are no longer important, although they are in more favor with the working class than with the business class. When Art and Music are considered at all, it is passive knowledge rather than active participation as formerly. There is one main cause for this change, the automobile. Group-sanctioned values such as thrift and home-ownership have been materially changed by this invention. The part that the radio and moving picture have played is also clearly presented.

The last two sections of the book bring out facts that most people of today recognize, namely that the American public is not very much interested in religion or in politics for it feels that the ideals and practices of the two differ.

The final summary of the study shows two very fundamental things about the average American audience. In the first place, money is becoming more important every day, and more people than ever before are swayed in their actions by want of it. Secondly, the average American is becoming more standardized in his desire to be like other people. Almost any appeal based on a desire for a reputation of being a conservative conformatist will bring action.

Middletown should prove profitable to those people who are interested in the changes in American life since 1890 and to those who are interested, as teachers of Public Speaking certainly are, in the things that appeal to American audiences today.

MARY E. WHITEFORD, *University of Illinois*

IN THE PERIODICALS

KITSON, HARRY D.: *The Talking Picture Moves to New Fields of Conquest.* The Nation's Schools, Vol. V, No. 5, May, 1930, pp. 47-52.

Mr. Kitson indicates that the talking picture presents many possibilities for adaptation to educational needs. As a supplementary technique it effects an enrichment of course-content and a stimulation of student interest. With reference to speech problems Mr. Kitson says:

> "Educators deplore the prevalence of incorrect speech. Vigorous efforts are being made by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH and by individual teachers to open the ears of people to their crudities and to help them overcome their defects. A valuable ally to such efforts would be a series of talking pictures made by outstanding exponents of correct speech. If every school in the United States could be equipped with a brief course on speech presented by such models as Walter Hampden or Julia Marlowe we should soon see an improvement in the speech of the next generation."

LESTER W. THONSSEN, *State University of Iowa*

LASSWELL, HAROLD D.: *Self-Analysis and Judicial Thinking.* The International Journal of Ethics, Vol. XL, No. 3, April, 1930, pp. 354-362.

Mr. Lasswell puts forward the thesis that "exclusive emphasis upon the importance of logical thinking incapacitates, rather than equips, the mind of the judge for the performance of its functions." And so he recommends a technique which will free "the mind of the distorting results of unseen compulsions."

There should be an inter-play of logical thought and free-phantasy. Logical thought "is a guided form of mental operation." Furthermore,

> "It proceeds by the affirmative of a starting-point, whose distinctive peculiarity is that it is in fact a vague indication of the goal to be reached, and develops by the criticism of the material which appears in consciousness according to its relevance to the end in view."

And thus the individual "guides the operations of his mind by means of this preliminary characterization of the desired terminal of his thinking."

Free-phantasy, on the other hand, is a type of unguided association.

> "From a given starting-point, no effort is bent toward the exclusion of the trivial, the trite, the embarrassing, the filthy, the non-sensical. The mind is permitted to run hither and thither, hospitably disposed toward anything which germinates, and subject only to negative efforts to avoid the molds of logic. There is no specific definition of an objective, and no intermittent intervention in the flow of material for the sake of registering its pertinence or impertinence to this rather definite goal."

The free-phantasy method may be used for the purpose of unearthing the roots of various emotional conditions which interfere with clean-cut decisions. The technique is instrumental in exposing "the hidden meanings which operate to bind and cripple the processes of logical thought."

Mr. Lasswell concludes his genuinely stimulating paper by saying that

> "We have tried to cure the failures of logical training by sermonizing rather than by offering supplementary and curative techniques of using the mind. It is fair to say that the mind is a much fitter instrument for reality testing when both blades are sharpened, those of logic and of free-phantasy. Until this proposition is sufficiently understood, the professional training of our judges, administrators, and theorists will continue to furnish discipline in self-deception rather than self-analysis, through a disproportionate emphasis upon a single mode of thought."

LESTER W. THONSSEN, *State University of Iowa*

SELLING THE AUDIENCE

Public speaking has its ups and downs. If it is now rising to a great crest of popularity, there are reasons obvious to every one. Radio and talking pictures have given speakers an audience greater in numbers than anything the world has previously known, and there is a scramble among managers to get all kinds of persons to say a few words to the eager multitude. Many of the new orators are modest enough in the presence of the microphone. They have

no special message, nothing to sell, and they realize that they are thrown to the mob that its curiosity about a well-known singer, novelist, tennis player or mother of triplets may be satisfied.

Some veteran public speakers are aware that an unexampled opportunity now lies ready to be grasped, and they have not been backward in selling their ideas to the vast audience. A teacher at the University of California, Edward Z. Rowell, makes some pertinent comments on this attitude in the April number of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH. He sees a striking change from the old indifference of speakers to their audience. In earlier textbooks on public speaking "one searches in vain for those sections on the audience which occupy so important a place in present-day "works." He cannot endure "this tendency to conceive of the very character of public speech in terms of salesmanship."

It will be difficult to eradicate the notion, which must be fairly fixed by this time, that public speakers, like salesmen, are trying to manipulate the thoughts of their listeners. In an age of selling, every activity takes some color from the general background. Mr. Rowell himself has pointed out that in a military age people think in military terms, or if exploration engages the world's attention they are influenced by that kind of adventure. Even religion in the former instance becomes a crusade, and in the latter a quest. To put public speaking on a higher level, especially when the orator is addressing several millions of listeners, will be hard. The audience must be ennobled simultaneously with those who address it.—Editorial, *New York Times*, April 4, 1930.

A STANDARD ACCENT

Cultured radio anouncers and all who seek to impose a national method of pronunciation will find a stout attack on their plan in University of Washington Chapbook No. 36. The author, Barrett H. Clark, views the whole idea with loathing and arraigns it with scorn. Particularly offensive does he find the effort to fuse the varieties of American speech into Broadway's idea of the accent of Piccadilly. In this country "bean" and "eye-tha" (for our rugged national "bin" and "eee-therr") do not belong. Whatever is in character is right, thinks Mr. Clark; the pronunciations and intonations of every area in the United States should be used

without self-consciousness or efforts for change by their owners wherever they may go. As change insensibly comes, through hearing different speech, let it come. Let anything come except "bean" and "eyetha." Above all, let the dialects endure.

The author is very much in earnest. Is not the country sufficiently standardized already? There is talk of a Standard Speech, but what is it? "Something set, arranged, classified by the lawgivers, Tilly, Jones, Passy; something written down in books and dictionaries; spoken in varying degrees of perfection by certain actors?" Away with it!

What were these people after? What did they want to teach their students? "Better English," I was told, but when I asked "Better than what?" I had to be satisfied with the answer: "Better than what they were already speaking."

People whose accents were to be improved and standardized were speaking according to their origin. At Chapel Hill, Mr. Clark was told that several persons present from afar had the desired lingual norm. Yet he heard Professor Baker of Yale pronounce "park" as "paah-k" in the fine New England way. Paul Green said "niggra" and "I declayah." A Middle Western scholar asked for a "motorr-carr." Applause from Mr. Clark. All this is right and proper. Let the Virginians, wherever they may dwell, say "cyah" and "I cannaught" so long as it is natural for them to do so. Let the aristocrat from Louisville inform others that he is "going ite" (for "out"). If the barefoot mountain lad returns from school and tells Pap that the growing things are "crops," let no one censure Pap for eying wistfully the gun over the fireplace. Brander Matthews used to say the snow was "thawrring." Let it thawrr! Mr. Clark's heart sinks when he hears Paul Robeson talk and sing like "Lord Morley addressing the House of Peers." The Harlem cultivates have synthetic English based on a variety of "cultured dialects." As an example of what the Standardizers would bring us all to, it makes the pamphleteer's blood run cold.

There is meat and wisdom in all this, and nothing to offend the grammarians. On the other hand, there is much in the program to delight the lovers of sources. Yet it may timidly be suggested to Mr. Clark that there are families in all parts of the nation which use "bean" and even "eyetha" steadily and without affectation.—Editorial, *New York Times,* April 13, 1930.

1930 CONVENTIONS

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

OUTLINE OF PROGRAM

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 28—

2:00 P. M. *Meeting of Executive Council.* Reports of Committee. Dinner at 6:30.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 29—

9:00 A. M. *Registration.*

9:30 A. M. (Sharp). *Call to order.* President's address (10 Minutes).

9:40 A. M. *Business meeting.* Election of nominating committee. Brief reports of committees and of Executive Council.

11:00 A. M. (Sharp). *General Session.* Two addresses (20 minutes each). Discussion.

12:30 P. M. *Group Luncheons.* (May be arranged as requested).

2:30 P. M. *General Session.* Two addresses (20 minutes each), on problems of curriculum. Discussion.

3:30 P. M. *Graded Sessions.* (a) Graduate School problems. (b) College problems, (c) Normal School and teachers' college problems, (d) Secondary school problems, (e) Elementary school problems.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 30—

9:00 A. M. (Sharp). *Topical Sessions.* Four major divisions of interest, with addresses to be announced (20 minutes each). (a) Rhetoric and Public Speaking, (b) Oral and Interpretative Reading, (c) Drama and Theatre, (d) Disorders of Speech.

12:30 P. M. *Association Luncheon.*

3:00 P. M. (Sharp). *General Session.* (At Mandel Hall, University of Chicago). Address by President Hutchins. General topic: What is Being Done for American Speech? *Speakers* representing Education, Science, Radio, and Talking Pictures.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 31—

9:00 A. M. (Sharp). *Topical Sessions.* Six rather narrow divisions of interest, with discussion topics and informal addresses (10 minutes each). (a) Debate, (b) Phonetics, (c) Radio Address, (d) Educational Dramatics, (d) Pro-

fessional Studies in Theatre Arts, (f) Disorders of Speech.

11:00 A. M. *Business Meeting.* Final reports. Elections. Resolutions.

2:00 P. M. *General Session.* Research topics. Two addresses (20 minutes each). Discussion.

3:00 P. M. *Round Tables on Research.* Informal discussion of latest contributions and projects. (a) Rhetoric and Persuasion, (b) Drama and Theatre, (c) Voice Science and Phonetics, (d) Disorders of Speech, (e) Curriculum and Pedagogy.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 1—

The entire day devoted to the study of Disorders of Speech. Program to be arranged by Dr. Kenyon. (See p. 543).

The convention will be held in Chicago and all meetings except the one on Tuesday Afternoon, December 30th, will take place at the Stevens Hotel.

In response to numerous requests to keep the program simple and informal, I am trying to confine all prepared papers to the general sessions and to the topical sessions on Tuesday morning. The graded sessions on Monday afternoon and the topical sessions on Wednesday morning will be built around discussion topics, with several informal speakers assigned to each and with plenty of time for discussion. The round tables for discussion of research will be entirely informal except in so far as the respective chairmen may choose to prime their groups in advance.

An attempt has also been made to keep as much routine business as possible off the convention floor and members who have new projects to introduce or opinion to offer on old projects are urged to submit them in writing for consideration at the first meeting of the Executive Council.

Among the features so far assured for the general session are:

An address on "The Traditions of our Subject" by Hoyt H. Hudson, Princeton University.

An address by Dr. Smiley Blanton, who has just returned from abroad, on some phase of the problem of stuttering.

An address of welcome by President Hutchins of the University of Chicago.

An address on the Max Reinhardt "Schauspiel und Regie Seminar" by Barclay S. Leathem, who has spent a year in study at that school.

An address by James M. O'Neill, University of Michigan, on the progress and prospects of his committee, which is cooperating with the English Council on curriculum division.

A series of addresses on the general topic of what is being done for American speech. The National Broadcasting Company will be represented by Miss Vida Ravenscroft Sutton, and the Columbia Broadcasting System by its Vice-President, Mr. Henry A. Bellows. Dean Immel has promised a speaker representing the talking picture industry; a man of science and a superintendent of schools are also assured.

There is some possibility of an address by Professor F. K. Foster, Director of Cadet Teaching, School of Education, University of Washing-

ton, on speech problems in the training of the teacher; also of a motion picture demonstration of the larynx in action by G. Oscar Russell, Ohio State University.

Among the possible speakers to be heard in the graded and topical sessions are C. K. Thomas, Cornell, on Phonetics; Mrs. Josephine Holmes, Mount Holyoke, on the European Theatre; James A. Winans, Dartmouth, on "Is Public Speaking Out?"; H. S. Woodward, Western Reserve, on new studies of audience opinion; and J. R. Lane, Wisconsin, on speech training in the grades. In addition Dr. Kenyon reports a dozen or more acceptances for the program in disorders of speech, which will be concentrated this year on a cooperative study of stammering.

Group luncheons may be arranged for Monday, December 29th, and also, if desired, for Wednesday, December 31st, at the rate of $1.75 per plate. It is suggested that committees and other small groups will find these luncheons time saving. One luncheon definitely scheduled for Monday will be for officers and delegates of regional associations, who will discuss ways and means of cooperation.

SPECIAL RAILROAD RATES ASSURED

Convention rates (fare and one-half for round trip) have been arranged as in past years. Do not purchase tickets without first obtaining full information (available at all R. R. ticket offices) regarding correct procedure.

Room reservations may be made by writing direct to Hotel Stevens, Chicago.

DISORDERS OF SPEECH AT THE DECEMBER CONVENTION

At the annual convention next December The American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech proposes to devote practically its entire program to the initiation of a cooperative nation-wide study of the treatment of stammering (stuttering). It proposes at this first session to study principles. At later meetings the problem of treatment will be analyzed more in deail. Eventually a plan of research aimed to determine those methods of treatment that are actually most helpful, will thus be arrived at. And, finally, actual research will, it is hoped, be instituted in a manner that shall be adequate to throw much light on this important and difficult problem.

The plan of cooperative study of the treatment of stammering includes the study, not only of methods, but also the manner of application of those methods, whether in schools or elsewhere, the thought being eventually to place the practical work of aiding the stammerer on the most efficient basis possible. This program of comparative study will not be limited to members of The American Society for the Study of Disorders of Speech.

Up to date the following persons have signified their intention to contribute papers for this cooperative study at the coming convention:

Miss Clara B. Stoddard, Detroit, Michigan; Meyer Solomon, M. D., Chicago, Ill.; Smiley Blanton, M. D., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Miss Jennie Hedrick, Washington, D. C.; Isadore H. Coriat, M. D., Boston, Mass.; Miss Eudora P. Estabrook, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Frederick W. Brown, A. M., New York City, N. Y.; G. Oscar Russell, Ph. D., Columbus, Ohio; Miss Pauline B. Camp, Madison, Wisconsin; Robert W. West, Ph. D., Madison, Wis.; Lee E. Travis, Ph. D., Iowa City, Ia.; John M. Fletcher, Ph. D., New Orleans, La.; Miss Mabel F. Gifford, Sacramento, Cal.; Samuel D. Robbins, A. M., Boston, Mass.; Miss Lavilla A. Ward, Madison, Wis.; Prof. Elizabeth McDowell, New York City, N. Y.; Mr. H. J. Heltman, Syracuse, N. Y.; Elmer L. Kenyon, M. D., Chicago, Ill.; Miss Letitia Raubichek, New York City, N. Y.

SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION OF WESTERN ASSOCIATION

The second Annual Convention of the Western Association of Teachers of Speech will be held in the William Taylor Hotel, San Francisco, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, November 27-29. The programs have been planned to appeal to teachers in all phases of the field and in all types of institutions. As this section goes to press, the following programs are planned:

Thursday Morning, November 27

Meetings of Committees: Executive Committee; Committee on Graduate Study in Speech, Lee Emerson Bassett, Stanford University, Chairman; Committee on Speech in Institutions of Collegiate Rank, Charles B. Mitchell, Oregon State College, Chairman; Committee on Speech Training in Secondary Schools, Esther L. Hettinger, High School, Marshfield, Oregon, Chairman; Committee on Speech Training in Elementary Schools, Alice C. Chapin, Supervisor of Speech Correction, Los Angeles Public Schools, Chairman; Committee on Educational Legislation, Herbert B. Maw, University of Utah, Chairman.

Thursday Afternoon—General Session

President's Address: 'Speech Training in a Democracy," W. Arthur Cable, University of Arizona.

Expression as a Step Toward the Explanation of Life, Annie H. Allen, University of California.

Festivals of the Old World (Observations on a recent trip around the world), Elizabeth E. Keppee, Pasadena Junior College.

Round Table Discussion: Making the Western Association a Twelve Month Working Organization.

Thursday Evening—Convention Dinner (Thanksgiving)

Friday Morning—Graduate School Session

Chairman, Lee Emerson Bassett

The Problem of a Graduate Curriculum in Speech, F. W. Orr, University of Washington.

The Problem of Thesis Subjects, Grafton P. Tanquary, University of Southern California.

The Proportion of M. A. Work to be Assigned in Speech, Maynard L. Daggy, State College of Washington.

Shall M. A. Applicants in Dramatics Be Accepted?, Joseph Smith, University of Utah.

FRIDAY MORNING—COLLEGE SESSION

Chairman, Dwight E. Watkins, University of California

The Place of the Teachers College in Enlarging Speech Training Program, Elizabeth Jenks, San Jose State Teachers College.

Training Expert Contest Judges in College Speech Classes, Louis A. Mallory, University of Wyoming.

Serving the Student Body and the Public by Radio Student Speeches, Readings, Recitals, and Plays, and by Staged Public Plays, Maynard L. Daggy.

FRIDAY MORNING—SECONDARY SCHOOL SESSION

Chairman, Alice Evelyn Craig, Polytechnic High School, Los Angeles

Utilitarian and Cultural Values of Speech Training in the High School, Mrs. Helen McGrew, High School, Greeley, Colorado.

The Training Needed by a High School Teacher of Speech, Paul J. Ritter, High School, Alhambra, California.

Benefits of an Association of High School Teachers of Speech, Mrs. Annice Campbell Moore, Roosevelt High School, Los Angeles.

FRIDAY MORNING—ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SESSION

Chairman, Harold W. Kaar, Contra Costa County Public Schools

An Adequate System of Speech Training for Elementary Schools, Alice C. Chapin.

Creative Dramatics in the Elementary School, Jessie D. Casebolt, San Francisco State Teachers College.

FRIDAY NOON—FRATERNITY LUNCHEON SESSION

The Local Speech Society and the Honorary Speech Fraternity in a Program of Speech Education, E. Ray Nichols, University of Redlands.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON—ORIGINAL SPEAKING

Chairman, Arnold Perstein, University of California

An Apology for Oratory, Benjamin D. Scott, Pomona College.

Persuasion in a Program of Speech Education, Grafton P. Tanquary.

Round Table Discussion of objectives, standards, criteria, content, methods of teaching:

Conversation
Committee and group discussion
Business speech
The popular address
The scientific or technical address.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON—ORAL INTERPRETATION

How to Get Students to Think Through a Selection While Presenting It, Alonzo J. Morley, Brigham Young University.

Musical Analysis and Effective Speaking, Ralph C. Hoeber, University of Oregon.

Poetry Reading Contests in Britain, Elizabeth E. Keppee.

The Platform Reading of Plays and Cuttings from Plays, with Demonstrations, Lee Greenleaf, High School, Santa Rosa, California.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON DRAMATICS

Carrying Drama to the State at Large, Lester Raines, New Mexico Normal University.

Utilizing our Folk Material in Play, Pageant, and Festival, Lillian Cavett, High School, Tucson, Arizona.

Puppetry in Education and Art, Sam Hume, Berkeley, California.

Methods of Teaching Student Acting, Mrs. Sara Huntsman Sturgess, University of California.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON—SPEECH SCIENCE

An Evaluation of Recent Literature on the Origin, Development, and Nature of Speech, Carlyn R. Winger, Pacific University.

Phonetic Analysis of Certain Recognized Vocal Defects with Suggestions for Treatment, Mrs. Alice W. Mills, University of Southern California.

A Structural Analysis of Voice Quality, Charles F. Lindsley, Occidental College.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON—SPEECH CORRECTION

Chairman, Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College

The Problem of Nomenclature in Speech Correction, Herbert E. Rahe, Willamette University.

Case Studies: A Vital Necessity in Speech Correction, Edna Cotrel, San Francisco Public Schools.

Concerning the Importance of the Theory of a Science of Therapy of Speech Disorders, Karl Cornelius Rothe, Director of classes for speech defective children in Vienna, Austria. The paper will be read in translation by Mrs. Hedwig Sporleder, Mill Valley, Cal.

SATURDAY MORNNIG—BUSINESS SESSION

SATURDAY MORNING—VOICE SCIENCE

Laboratory Researches in Emotional Evaluations with Tone and Resonance, T. Earl Pardoe, Pardoe Studios of Speech and Allied Arts, Los Angeles.

SATURDAY MORNING—FORENSICS

Re-orientation in the Field of Argumentation, Edward Z. Rowell, University of California.

Background for Debaters, J. Gordon Emerson, Stanford University.

Coaching Debate Teams, Charles A. Marsh.

SATURDAY MORNING—ORAL INTERPRETATION

Methods of Teaching Oral Interpretation, Elizabeth Lee Buckingham, Stanford University.

SATURDAY MORNING—STAGECRAFT AND EXPERIMENTAL THEATRE

The Model Stage and Its Uses (with demonstration), D. Palmer Young, Oregon State College.

Demonstration of Theatre Lights, Drapes, and Stage Sets, in charge of DeMarcus Brown, College of the Pacific.

SATURDAY MORNING—PHONETICS

The Letter *s*, Sarah T. Barrows, San Jose State Teachers College, California.

SATURDAY MORNING—SPEECH CORRECTION

The Young Stuttering Child and Its Training, Max Nadoleczny, University of Munich, Germany, Translated for the Convention by Mrs. Hedwig Sporleder.

Methods of Psychological Re-education in Speech Disorders, Mabel Farrington Gifford, Bureau of Correction of Speech Defects and Disorders, California State Department of Education.

SATURDAY MORNING—THE HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM IN SPEECH

A Program of Speech Training for the Secondary Schools, Esther L. Hettinger.

SATURDAY MORNING—SPEECH IN THE AUDITORIUM SYSTEM

Teaching Speech in the Public Schools Through the Auditorium System, Grace Bridges, Auditorium Supervisor, Portland (Ore.) Public Schools.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON—GENERAL SESSION

Presiding, Frederick W. Orr

The Work and Opportunities of the Speech Section of a State Education Association, Leon K. Whitney, South High School, Denver.

The Speaking Voice: Methods of Teaching and Objective Tests for Improvement, F. W. Orr.

A Reading of *Lazarus Laughed*, Irving Pichel, Berkeley, California.

Officers of the Western Association are: President, W. Arthur Cable; Vice-President, Frederick W. Orr; Secretary-Treasurer, Earl W. Wells, Oregon State.

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION

The first annual convention of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech was held May 2nd and 3rd at the Hotel Thomas Jefferson, Birmingham, Alabama. A constitution was adopted, a list of aims and objectives was unanimously passed, and the following officers were elected:

President—Edwin H. Paget, North Carolina State College.

Executive Secretary-Treasurer—T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama.

First Vice-President—Marvin G. Bauer, Washington and Lee University.

Second Vice-President—Wilhelmina G. Hedde, Sunset High School, Dallas, Texas.

Third Vice-President—Frances Gooch, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia.

Fourth Vice-President—Rose B. Johnson, Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, Alabama.

OFFICIAL AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

That those organizing the Southern Association plan that it should be an organization functioning actively twelve months in the year is obvious from the resolutions adopted covering the following:

1. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech is organized to bring together the Teachers of Speech in the South, in order that we may become better acquainted with each other, to provide a mutual interchange of ideas, to increase professional prestige, to raise the qualifications of Teachers of Speech, and to promote cooperation among ourselves, together with other Speech Associations, state, sectional and national.

2. Encourage every teacher of any phase of Speech education in the South, to join the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech and the National Association of Teachers of Speech.

3. Encourage every teacher of speech to take graduate study in speech and related subjects.

4. Develop so keen an interest in the problems of our profession that every teacher of speech in the South will think it imperative to attend every state and sectional convention and every annual convention of the National Association.

5. Encourage every Southern teacher of speech to conduct some form of research, both scientific and literary, into some particular phase of speech education; refer appropriate papers to the editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, other speech journals, and educational and psychological magazines.

6. Stimulate the formation in every Southern state of a state association of teachers of speech. Urge each state asociation to make a thorough canvass of the speech training provided by every school, college, and university in the state. Draw up a definite program of coöperation between the Southern Association and each state association.

7. Bring to the attention of every educational administrator in the South the many and varied reasons for including at least one required course in speech every two or three year period. Emphasize the necessity of securing qualified teachers of speech to direct this training. Insist that all extra-curricular activities in speech be conducted by trained teachers of speech, in a manner which will yield the maximum educational value.

8. Coöperate with the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary Schools, and the Committee on Speech Education in Normal Schools and Teachers Colleges, official committees of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, in projects sponsored by these committees. (See their reports in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, February, 1930).

9. Urge educational administrators in our public school systems to appoint supervisors of speech. Support the resolution passed at the 1929 (New York) Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH (See QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, February, 1930). That this resolution may have far-reaching influence, appoint for the Southern Association a Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Elementary Schools, and urge the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to establish a similar committee.

10. Devise means of coöperating with the Western Association of Teachers of Speech in determining a program upon which both associations agree. Urge teachers of speech in Mid-West and East to form similar sectional associations and join with us in working out a unified program.

11. Provide a clearing house for all helpful information concerning advances made in the teaching of any phase of speech. (A method which has worked successfully in one school and has aroused student or community interest in speech should be described in written form and made available to all teachers holding membership in the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech).

12. Draw up an approved suggested course of study for all courses in speech.

13. Analyze and formulate a more uniform attitude towards the contests on the constitution, both collegiate and secondary. Determine how we may best use these contests to improve the speech of our students and to awaken in educational administrators and the general public a sense of the need for universal speech training in our schools.

14. Consider the possibility of holding tournaments and league contests in debate, extempore speaking, interpretative reading, and play production, thse contests being sponsored by the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech.

15. Decide upon a public relations campaign which will bring in a dignified but persuasive manner to the general public a realization of how important a part speech education should play in our curriculum.

16. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech believes that the committee suggested by the Eastern Public Speaking Convention, relative to the oratorical contests on the Constitution, should consider as the major problem ways and means of persuading the educational administrators to appoint trained teachers of speech in all schools entered in the contest.

17. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech invites the Executive Committee of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH to consider New Orleans for the convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION in 1931.

18. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech hereby expresses its thanks and appreciation to President John Dolman, Jr., and Professor Rupert Cortright for their messages to the Convention.

19. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech expresses its

thanks to the Thomas Jefferson Hotel manager and staff for the many favors and courtesies extended during the convention.

20. The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech expresses its appreciation to Edwin H. Paget and T. Earle Johnson for their extraordinarily splendid work preparatory to organizing this association. (Mr. Johnson, who was a member of the Resolution Committee, dissented from the report of the Resolutions Committee as far as this resolution was concerned).

21. The officers of the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech shall hereby be empowered to take the necessary steps to put into effect the above resolutions.

The officers and members of the Southern Association hope that at the Chicago Convention of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH in December, these Aims and Objectives will be discussed in detail by the officers of the Western Association of Teachers of Speech and the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, as well as by those interested in the formation of a Central States Association, and that from this discussion will come a unified program for all regional associations and a plan for *coöperative* action with the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

ARTICLE I. NAME

The name of this Association shall be, THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

ARTICLE II. OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of this Association shall be: President, First, Second, Third and Fourth Vice-Presidents, and Executive Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. Each Vice-President shall be the Chairman of a committee to supervise some major activity of the Southern Association. Probable divisions are: (1) Colleges, Universities, and Normal Schools. (2) Secondary and Elementary Schools. (3) Extra Curricular activities sponsored by the Southern Association. (4) Public Relations.

ARTICLE III. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall consist of the elected officers of the Association and the president of each state association of teachers of speech affiliated with the Southern Association.

ARTICLE IV. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The President shall prepare the program for the annual convention, preside at all business meetings of the Association and of the Executive Committee, and perform such other duties as usually adhere to the office of president.

Section 2. The Vice-Presidents shall perform the duties stated in Article II, Section 2.

Section 3. The Executive Secretary-Treasurer shall perform all the ordinary duties of the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Association. As Treasurer he shall furnish a financial report to each annual convention.

ARTICLE V. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Membership in this Association shall be open, upon application, to any teacher of speech upon payment of the current annual dues.

Section 2. Other persons may be elected to membership by a majority vote of the members in attendance at any annual convention.

ARTICLE VI. AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any meeting of the Association by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The officers shall be elected by the Association at each convention. Nominations for this election shall be made by a committee of five chosen in the following manner: Without nominations from the floor the tellers shall distribute blank ballots on which each voter shall place the names of five members of the Association who are eligible to serve on the committee. No ballot containing more or fewer than five members shall be counted. The five members receiving the highest number of votes shall constitute the committee, the one receiving the largest plurality being chairman. Any ties in the voting shall be broken by the President. The nominating committee shall propose one or more names for each office. Before proceeding to a ballot the President shall always call for additional nominations from the floor.

ARTICLE II. DUES.

Section 1. The dues shall be Two ($2.00) Dollars per year, payable in advance.

Section 2. A combined membership fee of Four ($4.00) Dollars shall be acceptable to cover membership in this Association, membership in the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, and subscription to the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH.

Those desiring to receive a year's subscription to the *Speech Bulletin*, a supplement to THE QUARTERLY, published by the Committee for the Advancement of Speech Training in Secondary School, are to pay Four ($4.50) Dollars and Fifty Cents.

All teachers of speech in the South are urgently requested to send in their subscriptions immediately to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Professor T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama, University, Alabama. Additional financial contributions will be most welcome.

The Southern Association wishes to call attention to the innovations in its constitution concerning the duties of the Vice-Presidents and the presence of the presidents of state associations on the Executive Committee. At the end of the coming school year, a detailed report will be made on the success or failure of these innovations, as well as on the realization of the official Aims and Objectives. It is hoped that this report will be of value in determining the future activities, both of the regional associations and of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

The Executive Committee met immediately after the adjournment of the first convention and made plans for the next year's work, including plans for the Second Annual Convention. The 1931 Convention will be held in Atlanta, Georgia, April 16, 17, and 18, 1931, the hotel or school to be announced later. If practical, the Executive Committee hopes to have the convention sponsored by a college or university in or very near Atlanta.

The 1931 Convention will differ from the 1930 one in that high school and collegiate contests in various speech activities will be held. Contests in oratory, extempore speaking, literary interpretation, together with debating and dramatic tournaments, are planned. It is hoped by the Executive Committee that a large number of southern states will be represented in all the contests. Since students may represent their high schools or colleges in more than one contest an active and interesting session is anticipated. Teachers of speech throughout the South should take notice of the dates of the convention, plan to be there, and include the trip on their extra-curricular activities budget. In this way the ever present problem of financing may be met. A more detailed statement of the convention and its contests will be made in a future issue of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

HOTEL STATLER, CLEVELAND, OHIO,
November 27-29

The National Council of Teachers of English at the annual meeting in Cleveland at Thanksgiving time will consider "a curriculum vertically integrated to develop the tastes and powers useful in after life." Sessions will begin on Thanksgiving afternoon with reports of several committees, followed in the evening by three addresses on the appreciation of literature.

In conformity with the theme of the convention, the address of the President, Miss Ruth Mary Weeks, of Kansas City, will be on "Educating the Whole Child." There will be section meetings on oral English, written composition, reading, grammar, adapting to ability, junior college, teachers' colleges, junior and senior high schools, extra-curricular activities. The elementary section on Saturday morning offers nine speakers.

A significant international aspect of teaching will be furnished by a conference on European methods of teaching composition and literature under the chairmanship of Dr. J. H. Hanford, Western Reserve University.

Reports on methods of teaching in Italy, France, and Great Britain will be made by Phyllis Robbins of Boston, Russell P. Jameson of Oberlin, J. R. Derby of Iowa State College, and Bruno Rosselli of Vassar. About one hundred persons are scheduled to address the meetings, among them Harry C. Morrison of Chicago; Lucy Wilson of Philadelphia, recently in Chile to study schools; Lucy Chapman of the Ethical Culture School, New York; B. S. Monroe of Cornell; Merrill Bishop of San Antonio; Mabel C. Hermans of Los Angeles; O. B. Sperlin, University of Washington.

Conditions in Russia will be described at the banquet by Anna Louise Strong of Moscow, who will speak on "Mass Education in Reading," and Hallie Flanagan of Vassar, "The Educational Theater in Russia." Practical conditions in the theater will be discussed by Jane Keeler, who directed the winners of the Belasco cup, and Frederic McConnell, Director of the Cleveland Play House.

There will be three exhibits;—creative writing, model class room, books.

Reservations for rooms should be sent directly to the Statler Hotel. Purchasers of railroad tickets should ask for certificates, which, if a certain number are isued, will guarantee return tickets at reduced fares. Local committees, under the general chairmanship of Clarence Stratton, Director of English in Cleveland High Schols, are arranging details of meetings and entertainment.

NEWS AND NOTES

[Please send items for this department directly to Miss Lousene Rousseau, 49 East 33rd Street, New York City.]

MINUTES OF MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, MAY 3, 1930

A special meeting of the Executive Council, called by President Dolman, was held at the North Shore Hotel at Evanston, May 3rd, 1930. In addition to President Dolman, the following Council members were present: Ralph Dennis, H. L. Ewbank, H. B. Gough, Elmer Kenyon, C. P. Lahman, J. L. Lardner, E. C. Mabie, J. M. O'Neill, Henrietta Prentiss, F. M. Rarig, A. T. Weaver, and H. S. Woodward.

On invitation from President Dolman, W. W. Hatfield, Executive Secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, was present and told of the plans of the Council for a nation-wide study of the English curriculum looking toward the drafting of a course of study "integrated from primary grade to university." He invited the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION to appoint an advisory committee to work with the committee from the English Council in such matters as are of common interest. The Council moved that we express our appreciation to Mr. Hatfield and the members of the English Council for their spirit of coöperation and that President Dolman be empowered to appoint the committee. His appointments follow:

J. M. O'Neill, University of Michigan, Chairman.
Gladys Borchers, Wisconsin High School, Madison.
Carroll P. Lahman, Western State Teachers College.
Emma Grant Meader, Russell Sage College.
Henrietta Prentiss, Hunter College.
Charles K. Thomas, Cornell University.

The Executive Council approved President Dolman's recommendation that the 1930 convention be held at the Hotel Stevens.

A resolution was presented from the Eastern Public Speaking Conference asking that a committee be appointed to investigate oratorical contests conducted by various organizations for propaganda purposes. The President was authorized to appoint such a committee to investigate and make a report to the Executive Council in December. The committee follows:

W. N. Brigance, Wabash College, Chairman.
A. Craig Baird, State University of Iowa.
C. C. Cunningham, Northwestern University.
Helen Osband, Alabama Women's College.
A. B. Williamson, New York University.

The remainder of the morning session was devoted to a discussion of general plans for the convention program. The Council adjourned for lunch and met again for an afternoon session. A letter was read from R. L. Cortright, Chairman of the Committee on Speech Training in Secondary Schools, telling of the activities of his Committee and asking for instructions concerning future publications. The Council moved that the Committee be asked to prepare two specialized bulletins for publication during the year 1930-31. It was suggested that each bulletin present some one phase of speech work in secondary schools and that at least 2,000 copies should be printed. A committee consisting of Ralph Dennis, Chairman, J. M. O'Neill, and Miss Henrietta Prentiss was appointed to investigate possible sources of financial support for Association projects.

H. L. EWBANK,
Secretary.

The following program was given at the Speech session of the Michigan Schoolmasters' Club, held at Ann Arbor in April.

MORNING SESSION

Speech Without a Larynx, Henry Moser, Speech Department, University of Michigan.

A Study of Time Variations in Speaking, F. B. McKay, Michigan State Normal College.

The Mechanics of the Speech Process, J. H. Muyskens, Speech Department, University of Michigan.

Demonstration of Reflexology as Carried on in our School System, Mrs. Maud Stilson, Flint Public Schools. (Scenic Effects, Harold Westlake, Fordson High School).

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Relationship of English to Speech, Preston Scott, College of the City of Detroit.

The Debater—Student, Fighter, or Educator?, Howard S. Woodward, Western Reserve University.

The School and the Theatre, Miss Jessie Bonstelle, Detroit Civic Theatre.

The following program was given at the speech section of the Inland Empire Education Association at Spokane, Washington, April 9:

Chairman, Earl Wells, Oregon State College.

"Conducting a Course in Public Speaking in the High School," Esther Hettinger, Marshfield High School, Oregon.

"The Fundamentals of a High School Course in Public Speaking," Florence Johnson, State Normal School, Monmouth, Oregon.

"An Analysis of Stage Fright," James Carrell, State Normal School, Bellingham, Washington.

"Promoting a Program of Dramatics in the High School," J. L. Purdy, Hillyard High School, Spokane, Wash.

"Putting on Plays in the Small High School," Maynard Lee Daggy, Washington State College.

New officers of the Conference are Maynard Lee Daggy, President; Esther Hettinger, Vice-President; Marie Hollingshead, Cheney Normal School, Washington, Scretary-Treasurer. In the future, this section of the Inland Empire Education Association will be known as the Northwest Speech Conference.

At the Speech Training Section of the Wisconsin Teachers Association the following program was presented on October 31st, under the Chairmanship of Professor Gladys L. Borchers of the University of Wisconsin:

GENERAL SESSION

Reading, Professor Gertrude E. Johnson, University of Wisconsin.

Address—"The Mental Hygiene Approach to Speech," Professor F. M. Rarig, University of Minnesota.

Round Table on Speech for the Grades and Junior High School, Carrie Rasmussen, Madison Public Schools.

Round Table on Public Speaking and Debate, Henry Phillips Boody, Ripon College.

Round Table on Dramatics and Interpretation, F. Theodore Cloak, Lawrence College.

At the annual convention of the National Council of Teachers of English to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, November 27-29 members of our Association wil make contributions to the program as folows:

Professor R. L. Cortright, Detroit City College—"Speech Training in Secondary English Classes."

Mrs. Letitia Raubicheck, New York City Public Schools—"Program for Progressive Speech Training."

Professor Everett Hunt, Swarthmore College—"Public Discussion."

Professor J. M. O'Neill, University of Michigan—"Relation of Extra-Curricular Activity to Curricular Ends in Speech."

Final events in the West Virginia High School Literary Contest were held at the West Virginia University, April 12, 1930. Wilbur Jones Kay of that institution was chairman of the contest. The contest covers several branches, and includes separate contests in debating, extemporaneous speaking, oratory, and essays. Preliminary contests were held in the morning and afternoon, and the final in each branch in the evening. The prizes are most attractive: a four year scholarship to West Virginia University to each winner of first place; a gold medal to each winner of first place; a silver medal to each winner of second place; a bronze medal to all other contestants, winners in district contests; a silver loving cup to

each school represented by a winner of first place, to be held for one year or until won three times; and a wall plaque to each school represented by a winner of first place to be hung on school wall as a permanent possession. Ninety-five schools with 350 contestants participated in eleven district contests previous to this state contest.

During the week of May 1 the University of Arizona sponsored the annual high school speech contests: the Eleventh Annual State Championship Debate, the Sixteenth Annual State Oratorical Contest, and the third annual contests in extemporaneous speaking, interpretative reading (excluding humorous readings, humorous selections, and one-act plays). Four students participated in the debate, six each in the forensic and reading contests, and about forty students in the one-act play contest, in which ten high schools were entered. The popularity of these contests is indicated by the fact that while Arizona has only fifty-five accredited high schools, widely scattered, approximately one hundred ten high school students participated in the preliminary contests, held in each district. Nearly one thousand students took part in the local contests held to select the district representatives. The director of Arizona Interscholastic Speech Activities is W. Arthur Cable, of the University of Arizona.

The officers of the Pacific Forensic League for 1930-1931 are: President, Charles A. Marsh, University of California at Los Angeles; Vice-President, Jasper V. Garland, University of Idaho; and Secretary-Treasurer, Benjamin D. Scott, Pomona College.

The Electrical Utilities sponsored an elaborate series of oratorical contests throughout the United States during the past spring. Public utility organizations held contests within their own organizations, and then with competing organizations in their own territory. More than four thousand contestants participated in contests during the spring. The final national contest was held at San Francisco in June, when liberal prizes were awarded, the winner receiving a trip to Europe. The idea back of the contest is to furnish employees opportunities for training in speaking.

Debating as a means of training in a foreign language is somewhat novel, but it has been tried out at Yale University. During the spring four students were sent to South America for ten debates with teams of Latin-American colleges, all of them in Spanish. Before their departure, the members of the team pledged themselves not to speak a word of English during the entire two months of the trip. The Carnegie Endowment, through its International Relations Clubs, financed the trip. Colleges de-

bated were the University of Guayaquil, the Central University of Ecuador, at Quito, the University of San Mareos, Peru, the University of Chile, the Catholic University of Santiago, the University of Concepcion, Chile, the University of Buenos Aires, the Instituto Cultural, Argentina, the University of La Platta, Argentina, and the University of Montevideo, Uraguay.

A bi-lingual debating team was sent to this country by the University of Porto Rico late in April to debate Yale, Princeton, and Boston Universities. The debates with Princeton and Boston were in English, and that with Yale in Spanish. Yale debaters had visited the University of Porto Rico the year before and defeated the native debaters in a debate held in Spanish. The Yale debate this year was on the proposition: "Resolved: That a league made up solely of countries of the Americas and governed by regulations similar to those of the League of Nations would do more to promote universal peace than the present League of Nations alone." The Princeton debate was on the proposition: "Resolved: That a Pan-American league of nations is desirable to balance the influence of the original League of Nations." Boston met the visitors on the proposition: "Resolved: That the United States should cease to intervene in the affairs of the countries of Central and South America without a formal declaration of war."

The State Championship Debate—the thirteenth—of the Michigan High School Debating League, was held in Ann Arbor April 25. An audience of 4000 people heard the debate, which was held in the Hill Auditorium of the University of Michigan. Of this number, 1500 were high school students sent to Ann Arbor as delegates from 150 schools throughout the state.

The Cambridge School of the Drama has recently completed its first term. The school aims to provide courses in the drama not otherwise provided for students in Harvard University and Radcliffe College, as well as for others who prove themselves able to do the work. The first courses offered were Playwriting, Play Production, and Contemporary Theatre and Its Backgrounds. Albert R. Lovejoy is director of the School, and the large Board of Governors includes Walter Prichard Eaton, Winthrop Ames, Philip Barry, Heywood Broun, Walter Hampden, Sidney Howard, Robert Edmond Jones, Kenneth MacGowan, Percy MacKaye, Hiram K. Motherwell, Eugene O'Neill, Lee Simonson, Owen Wister, and several others equally well known.

The fifth annual Arizona State Drama convention was held at the University of Arizona early in May. This organization sponsors the one-act play contests staged each spring during University Week, ten high schools having casts entered for the last contest. Among the plays performed were *The Bishop's Candlestick, Fixin's, The Florist Shop, It Can't*

Be Done, Matinata, Will o' the Wisp, The Cat's Canary, The Coming of Fair Annie, The Giant's Stair, and *The Maker of Dreams.* For the current year the Association is encouraging the writing and production of Arizona folk plays and plays embodying ancient lore peculiar to Arizona and the southwest. Officers of the Association are: President, Max P. Voskuhler, University of Arizona Extension Division; Vice-President, Mrs. Southworth, Prescott; Secretary, W. Arthur Cable, University of Arizona; Treasurer, Esther R. Sprester, Bisbee Senior High School.

One of the most unusual and interesting dramatic productions reported in a long time is the performance of the opera *Martha* at the University of Minnesota this summer. The production was exceptional in many ways. In the first place, there were two separate casts, one of singers and one of actors. The leading roles were sung by noted stars, Paul Althouse and Maria Matyas. Th singers, however, did not act the roles. Chorus and orchestra were in the pit, and the action was performed by actors on the stage. Part of the action was carried out in silhouette-pantomime, and other parts were in exotic color. The staging was most elaborate, three separate stages being used, which were combined into one mammoth stage for the final scene of each act. Special lighting equipment was constructed. Earle Killeen, Professor of Music at the University of Minnesota, directed the musical part, and Lester Raines was brought from New Mexico Normal University to direct the dramatic performance.

The College Theatre of the University of Alabama has completed its first year, major productions during that time including *Gammer Gurton's Needle, Beggar on Horseback,* and *Antigone.* The Theatre is an all-college institution, and brings into coöperation the departments of English, Speech, Latin, Physical Education, Home Economics, Music, and Art. Season tickets were sold for one dollar, and the audiences were large enough to finance the production of the three plays and to add new equipment. The theatre itself is exceptionally well adapted to dramatic work. The acoustics are excellent; the prosecenium width is thirty-five feet, and the stage is thirty-three feet deep and fifty feet high. Equipment is modern and complete. The director of the College Theatre is W. H. Trumbauer.

Three of the past season's major productions at the University of Wisconsin were repeated, with casts practically intact, during the summer session: *Enter Madame, Six Characters in Search of an Author,* and *Othello.* William C. Troutman directed the plays.

Eight districts were represented in the one-act play contest held recently in Florida. The winning plays were Gilbert Emery's *Thank You, Doctor* and *The Valiant,* by Hall and Middlemass.

Boar's Head Dramatic Society of Syracuse University recently staged Moliere's *L'Avare*.

Under the direction of E. D. Schonberger, the Senior Class of the University of North Dakota presented Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*, as part of the Commencement program.

The New York State School of Agriculture, through the medium of Kermis, the dramatic organization there, is conducting a play-writing contest, which closes December first. Prizes of $125, $60, $30, and $15 will be awarded the plays selected by the committee, of which A. M. Drummond is chairman.

Master Pierre Patelin was produced at New Mexico Normal University last spring, with Lester Raines directing.

The Mask and Gavel spring play, at Bradley Polytechnic Institute, was *Within the Law*, directed by C. H. McReynolds, who likewise directed the annual Commencement Festival, *The Passing of the Torch*.

The University of Arkansas recently sponsored a one-act play contest, which was held at Fayetteville late in March. The winning play was *The Sponge*, presented by the Texas Christian University Dramatic Club, under the direction of the Public Speaking Department of that institution.

The Commencement Plays at Leland Powers School were *Shall We Join the Ladies*, and *Dear Brutus*, the former serving as a curtain-raiser.

Celebrating both the bi-millenium of the birth of Virgil and the tercentenary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, more than two hundred students of Mount Holyoke College presented in May a pageant of the adventures of Aeneas.

Eighty-three American colleges and universities sent official representatives to Emerson's semi-centennial exercises. It was the largest representation of higher educational institutions ever attending an Emerson College event.

The School of Expression in Boston likewise celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its founding by Dr. and Mrs. Curry during the past year.

PERSONALS

MISS ELSIE FOGERTY VISITS THE UNITED STATES

American teachers of speech have been greatly interested in the visit to this country during the summer of Miss Elsie Fogerty, director of the Central School of Speech Training and Dramatic Art in London. This school is probably better known to American speech teachers than any other outside of America, and its courses are attracting increasing numbers of them.

During her visit to this country, which covered a period of some ten weeks, Mis Fogerty visited and lectured before the student bodies of the University of Michigan, Northwestern University, the University of Wis-

consin, the Valley City, North Dakota, State Normal School, the Bellingham, Washington, State Normal School, the Oregon State Teachers College, the University of California, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology. Just before her return to London the editor of this department had the privilege of an interesting interview with Miss Fogerty. In the belief that American teachers will be interested to "see ourselves as others see us" a few of the impressions resulting from the interview are recorded here.

In the first place, Miss Fogerty was anxious to impress upon American teachers the fact that the problem of bad voices is not a purely American one, as we are sometimes inclined to think. Probably almost as large a percentage of British children are seriously in need of speech training as of American children. However, our problem is aggravated by the high percentage of foreign-born or children of foreign-born, as well as by the general tension resulting from the mad pace of living in the United States. Another factor in the American problem, Miss Fogerty thinks, is the prevalence of the gum-chewing habit, which develops tongue and throat positions quite contrary to those conducive to good speech.

Speech training is much more general in the elementary grades in England than it is in the United States. At first this training is confined largely to constant drills for improving the quality of the voice, by means of reading poetry in unison and singing. For some time the training is entirely unconscious on the child's part, no technical instruction or terminology being employed.

The point which impressed the writer most in Miss Fogertys' discussion of speech training in England is the vastly greater harmony there between the related branches of speech, singing, and physical education. In that country they are considered inseparable, and, since they are all utilized *toward the same end*, the results of speech training are plainly evident in British children almost from the beginning.

Asked to state her impression of American work in speech, Miss Fogerty replied that she was most amazed at the great increase in the interest in and the facilities for speech training in this country since her last visit to the United States, in 1913. She was particularly impressed by the extent of the work in the larger institutions of the Middle West, with their scientific equipment, their laboratories, and, most of all, their clinics. Miss Fogerty is greatly interested in the speech work of our teachers colleges, which, in her opinion, as in the opinion of those of us who have struggled to bring up the standards in those institutions, should be our chief concern, since it is from them that the teachers of the public school children come. And it is there that real speech training must begin.

Our greatest need, Miss Fogerty feels, is closer coöperation among ourselves. Increasing emphasis upon specialization frequently results in members of the same department knowing next to nothing of each other's work. Much significant research is being carried on, too, without making

the results known widely enough. Conventions and conferences and associations should serve as clearing houses for such information.

Pressed for information about her own work, Miss Fogerty said that the Central School of Speech Training and Dramatic Art is an "Approved Course" for the Diploma in Dramatic Art of the University of London, which means that it is an affiliated school. Courses for speech teachers include Diction, Recitation, Theory and Practice of Voice Training, Phonetics, French, Poetics, Dramatic History, History of Costume, Elementary Anatomy and Physiology and Elementary Psychology, both applied to Movement, Voice, and Speech, Acting and Rehearsal, Classical Dancing; Deportment, Mime, Fencing, Speech Clinic, and Practice Teaching.

Miss Fogerty stated that a great deal of credit for arousing and maintaining an active interest in speech in England is due to Mr. and Mrs. John Masefield, who have for several years sponsored the new famous Oxford Poetry Reading Contest, and to Dr. Aikin, whose book on voice training is well known to American teachers.

Miss Fogerty requested the writer to express her appreciation of the genuinely cordial reception accorded her everywhere she went in the United States.

Lou Kennedy received her Ph. D. degree in speech at the University of Wisconsin in June, and is now in charge of the courses in phonetics and speech correction at the University of Minnesota. Bryng Bryngelson, whose place Miss Kennedy has taken, is spending the year in graduate study at the University of Iowa.

Ray Barnard, who likewise received his Ph. D. degree at the University of Wisconsin in June, is now teaching speech at the State Teachers College, LaCrosse, Wisconsin, where he is chairman of the department. During the past year he held a fellowship at Wisconsin in the School of Education.

Miss Geraldine Warren and Miss Geraldine Quinlan of the Department of Speech of Elmira College took a group of Elmira students and their friends to Europe this summer, the chief objectives of the tour being the Passion Play at Oberammergau and the Reinhardt Festival at Salzburg.

Miss Ruth Kentzler, who spent the summer teaching at the University of Colorado, has accepted a position teaching speech in Central High School, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mrs. Eugene Fife, of Butler University, gave courses in Interpretative Reading and Drama for Grade Schools during the Summer Session of the Indianapolis Teachers College.

Rupert Cortright, formerly of Syracuse University, taught during the summer at the School of Speech, Northwestern University, and is now a member of the faculty at the College of the City of Detroit.

Forrest H. Rose, who taught at the State Teachers College at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, this summer, has resigned his position at Park College and joined the faculty at Cape Girardeau.

William N. Brigance received his Ph. D. degree from the University of Iowa in June, and has returned to Wabash College, where he is the chairman of the Department of Speech. He spent the summer in California.

Albert G. Mohr, a long time member of the Association, 2903 Valentine Avenue, New York City, died in January.

Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Van Wye returned in May from an eight-months trip around the world. They visited the Panama Canal, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Hawaii, Japan, Korea, Mukden, Peking, Shanghai, Hong Kong, Indo-China, Cambodia, Siam, Rangoon, India, Egypt, and Europe. Mr. Van Wye visited universities and colleges and spent some time studying in London.

Carl Cass, who received his M. A. in speech at the University of Wisconsin last June, is now in charge of play production at the University of Pittsburgh.

James R. Sterrett Jr., who spent the past year in graduate study at the University of Wisconsin, has returned to Center College, Kentucky.

Among the changes in the Wisconsin staff this year are the following: Claude Kantner, who received his M. A. degree in August, is assisting Dr. West in place of Lou Kennedy, whose position at Minnesota is mentioned elsewhere; Eugene Bahn, who received his degree of M. A. in June, has been appointed an assistant; and G. A. Kopp, who received the M. A. degree at the same time, has been elected to a Research Assistantship in the University. Carl Taylor, who was a graduate student in the University last year and taught there the past summer, has accepted a position in the Junior College of the University of Wisconsin Extension Division, Milwaukee. Richard Phillips, formerly assistant to Professor J. P. Ryan at Grinnell has joined the staff.

Ralph B. Wagner, chairman of the Department of Expression at St. Louis University, was recently awarded the highest honor conferred by the School of Expression—the diploma for philosophic realization in the Speech Arts. During the summer he acted as dean of the Denver Summer Session of the Curry School, and has now returned to St. Louis University.

Moroni Olsen, who was at one time associated with Maurice Brown in Seattle, and who has more recently directed the Moroni Olson Players, has become the director of dramatics at Leland Powers School.

C. H. McReynolds has resigned the chairmanship of the Public Speaking Department of Bradley Polytechnic Institute to join the faculty of the Western State College at Gunnison, Colorado.

Dr. Emma Grant Meader's article on "Speech Training in the Elementary Schools in England and the United States" hich appeared in the April issue of the Journal will be reprinted in the bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association.

Miss Kathryn Sellars, M. A. Wisconsin, 1930, has accepted a position as Director of Dramatics at Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Illinois.

Mr. Sherman P. Lawton, M. A. Michigan, 1930, has also joined the Speech Staff at Bradley.

Mr. Wells Harrington, B. A. Wisconsin, 1929, who spent the year 1929-30 teaching Speech in the Kalamazoo High School, has accepted a position in the Department of Speech at San Jose Teachers College, California.

Miss Dorothy Kaucher, Ph. D. Cornell, 1929, has transferred from Wells College to San Jose State Teachers College.

Professor B. W. Folsom, M. A. Wisconsin, 1930, formerly at Dickinson College, will teach at West Virginia Wesleyan this year.

A. E. Whitehead, M. A. Wisconsin, 1930, has been appointed to the faculty of the State University of Idaho.

James R. Cretcher, B. A. Albion, 1928, formerly of the East High School of Lansing, Michigan succeeds Kenneth Hance as Professor of Speech at Olivet College, Olivet, Michigan. Kenneth Hance has joined the staff at Albion College.

Professor John Dolman, Jr., President of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, attended a meeting of Summer Session Directors held in Madison, Wisconsin on October 24th and 25th. Incidentally he conferred with the Executive Secretary, the Editor, and other members of the Council and transacted considerable business by way of arrangements for the forthcoming annual convention of the Association to be held at Hotel Stevens, December 29, 30, and 31.

The National Forensic League is planning a National Speech Tournament for the season 1930-31. Details have not yet been determined but it is expected that there will be national contests in Debating, Oratory, Declamation, and Extempore Speaking. Winners of the first or second places in state-wide contests, either under the sponsorship of the League or of any other organization, will be eligible to compete in the national contests to be held about May 1st, probably at Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin. The officers of the League are—President, Ray Cecil Carter, High School, Albany, New York; Vice-President, Carl E. Mundt, State Teachers College, Madison, South Dakota; Secretary, Bruno E. Jacob, Ripon College.